arXiv:math/0403442v1 [math.AP] 25 Mar 2004

On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, Part II: Liouville, Harnack and Yamabe

Aobing Li & YanYan Li
Department of Mathematics
Rutgers University
110 Frelinghuysen Rd.
Piscataway, NJ 08854

Abstract

The Yamabe problem concerns finding a conformal metric on a given closed Riemannian manifold so that it has constant scalar curvature. This paper concerns mainly a fully nonlinear version of the Yamabe problem and the corresponding Liouville type problem.

1 Introduction

Let (M, g) be an n-dimensional compact smooth Riemannian manifold (without boundary). For $n = 2$, we know from the uniformization theorem of Poincaré that there exist metrics that are pointwise conformal to g and have constant Gauss curvature. For $n \geq 3$, the well-known Yamabe conjecture states that there exist metrics which are pointwise conformal to g and have constant scalar curvature. The Yamabe conjecture is proved through the work of Yamabe [73], Trudinger [66], Aubin [2] and Schoen [61]. The Yamabe and related problems have attracted much attention in the last 30 years or so, see, e.g. [65], [3], and the references therein. Important methods and techniques in overcoming loss of compactness have been developed in such studies which also play important roles in the research of other areas of mathematics. For $n \geq 3$, let $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ where u is some positive function on M. The scalar curvature $R_{\hat{g}}$ of $\hat{g}$ can be calculated as

$$R_{\hat{g}} = u^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} \Big(R_g u - \frac{4(n-1)}{n-2} \Delta_g u \Big),$$

where R_g and Δ_g denote respectively the scalar curvature and the Laplace-Beltrami operator of g. The Yamabe conjecture is therefore equivalent to the existence of a positive solution of

$$-L_g u = \bar{R} u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}} \quad \text{on } M,$$

where $L_g := \Delta_g - \frac{n-2}{4(n-1)} R_g$ is the conformal Laplacian of g, and $\bar{R} = 0$ or $\pm 2(n-1)$. The Yamabe problem can be divided into three cases — positive case, zero case and negative case — according to the signs of the first eigenvalue of $-L_g$. Making a conformal change of metrics $\tilde{g} = \varphi^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$, where φ is a positive eigenfunction of $-L_g$ associated with the first eigenvalue, we are led to the following three cases: $R_g > 0$ on M, $R_g \equiv 0$ on M and $R_g < 0$ on M. The positive case, i.e. $R_g > 0$, is much more difficult.

Let

$$A_g := \frac{1}{n-2}(Ric_g - \frac{R_g}{2(n-1)} g)$$

denote the Schouten tensor of g, where Ric_g denotes the Ricci tensor of g. We use $\lambda(A_g) = (\lambda_1(A_g), \cdots, \lambda_n(A_g))$ to denote the eigenvalues of A_g with respect to g. Clearly

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i(A_g) = \frac{1}{2(n-1)} R_g.$$

Let

$$V_1 = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i > 1\},$$

and let

$$\Gamma(V_1) = \{s\lambda \mid s > 0, \ \lambda \in V_1\}$$

be the cone with vertex at the origin generated by V_1.

The Yamabe problem in the positive case can be reformulated as follows: Assuming $\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma(V_1)$, then there exists a Riemannian metric $\hat{g}$ which is pointwise conformal to g and satisfies $\lambda(A_{\hat{g}}) \in \partial V_1$ on M.

In general, let V be an open convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ which is symmetric with respect to the coordinates, i.e., $(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in V$ implies $(\lambda_{i_1}, \cdots, \lambda_{i_n}) \in V$ for any permutation $(i_1, \cdots, i_n)$ of $(1, \cdots, n)$. We assume that $\emptyset \neq \partial V$ is in $C^{2,\alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ in the sense that ∂V can be represented as the graph of some $C^{2,\alpha}$ function near every point. For $\lambda \in \partial V$, let $\nu(\lambda)$ denote the inner unit normal of ∂V. We further assume that

$$\nu(\lambda) \in \Gamma_n := \{\lambda \in R^n | \lambda_i > 0, \forall 1 \le i \le n\}, \qquad \forall\ \lambda \in \partial V, \tag{1}$$

and

$$\nu(\lambda)\cdot\lambda > 0, \qquad \forall\ \lambda \in \partial V. \tag{2}$$

Let

$$\Gamma(V) := \{s\lambda \mid \lambda \in V,\ 0 < s < \infty\}. \tag{3}$$

be the (open convex) cone with vertex at the origin generated by V.

Our first theorem establishes the existence and compactness of solutions to a fully nonlinear version of the Yamabe problem on locally conformally flat manifolds. A Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) is called locally conformally flat if near every point of M the metric can be represented in some local coordinates as $g = e^{\psi(x)}\sum_{i=1}^n (dx^i)^2$.

Theorem 1.1 *For $n \geq 3, \alpha \in (0,1)$, we assume that V is a symmetric open convex subset of R^n, with $\emptyset \neq \partial V \in C^{4,\alpha}$, satisfying (1) and (2). Let (M^n, g) be a compact, smooth, connected, locally conformally flat Riemannian manifold of dimension n satisfying*

$$\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma(V), \qquad on\ M^n.$$

Then there exists a positive function $u \in C^{4,\alpha}(M^n)$ such that the conformal metric $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ satisfies

$$\lambda(A_{\hat{g}}) \in \partial V, \qquad on\ M^n. \tag{4}$$

Moreover, if (M^n, g) is not conformally diffeomorphic to the standard $n-$sphere, then all positive solutions of (4) satisfy

$$\|u\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g)} + \|\frac{1}{u}\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g)} \leq C, \qquad on\ M^n,$$

where C is some positive constant depending only on (M^n, g), V and α.

Remark 1.1 *Presumably, the existence of a $C^{2,\alpha}$ solution of (4) should hold under the weaker smoothness hypothesis $\partial V \in C^{2,\alpha}$. We prove this under an additional hypothesis that V is strictly convex, i.e., principal curvatures of ∂V are positive everywhere. See Appendix B.*

We propose the following

Conjecture 1.1 *Assume that V is an open symmetric convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, with $\emptyset \neq \partial V \in C^\infty$, satisfying (1) and (2). Let (M^n, g) be a compact smooth Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$ satisfying*

$$\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma(V), \qquad on\ M^n.$$

Then there exists a smooth positive function $u \in C^\infty(M^n)$ *such that the conformal metric* $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ *satisfies*

$$\lambda(A_{\hat{g}}) \in \partial V, \qquad \textit{on } M^n. \tag{5}$$

For $V = V_1$, it is the Yamabe problem in the positive case. In general, the equation of u is a fully nonlinear elliptic equation of second order, and therefore the problem can be viewed as a fully nonlinear version of the Yamabe problem.

The fully nonlinear version of the Yamabe problem has the following equivalent formulation. The equivalence of the two formulations is shown in Appendix B.

Let

$$\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ be an open convex symmetric cone with vertex at the origin} \tag{6}$$

satisfying

$$\Gamma_n \subset \Gamma \subset \Gamma_1 := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n | \sum_i \lambda_i > 0\}. \tag{7}$$

Naturally, Γ being symmetric means $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma$ implies $(\lambda_{i_1}, \lambda_{i_2}, \cdots, \lambda_{i_n}) \in \Gamma$ for any permutation $(i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_n)$ of $(1, 2, \cdots, n)$.

For $\alpha \in (0,1)$, let

$$f \in C^{4,\alpha}(\Gamma) \cap C^0(\overline{\Gamma}) \text{ be concave and symmetric in } \lambda_i, \tag{8}$$

satisfying

$$f|_{\partial\Gamma} = 0, \qquad \nabla f \in \Gamma_n \text{ on } \Gamma, \tag{9}$$

and

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} f(s\lambda) = \infty, \qquad \forall\ \lambda \in \Gamma. \tag{10}$$

Conjecture 1.1 is equivalent to

Conjecture 1.1′**.** *Assume that* (f, Γ) *satisfies (6), (7), (8), (9) and (10). Let* (M^n, g) *be a compact smooth Riemannian manifold of dimension* $n \geq 3$*, satisfying* $\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma$ *on* M^n*. Then there exists a smooth positive function* $u \in C^\infty(M^n)$ *such that the conformal metric* $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ *satisfies*

$$f\left(\lambda(A_{\hat{g}})\right) = 1, \quad \lambda(A_{\hat{g}}) \in \Gamma, \qquad \textit{on } M^n. \tag{11}$$

Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to

Theorem 1.1$'$. *For $n \geq 3, \alpha \in (0,1)$, we assume that (f,Γ) satisfies (6), (7), (8), (9) and (10). Let (M^n, g) be a compact, smooth, connected, locally conformally flat Riemannian manifold of dimension n satisfying $\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma$ on M^n. Then there exists a positive function $u \in C^{4,\alpha}(M^n)$ such that the conformal metric $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}$ satisfies (11). Moreover, if (M^n, g) is not conformally diffeomorphic to the standard $n-$sphere, all solutions of (11) satisfy*

$$\|u\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g)} + \|\frac{1}{u}\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g)} \leq C, \tag{12}$$

where $C > 0$ is some constant depending only on (M^n, g), (f, Γ) and α.

Remark 1.2 *C^0 and C^1 bounds of u and u^{-1} do not depend on the concavity of f. This can be seen from the proof.*

For $1 \leq k \leq n$, let

$$\sigma_k(\lambda) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq n} \lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_k}$$

be the $k-$th symmetric function and let Γ_k be the connected component of $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sigma_k(\lambda) > 0\}$ containing the positive cone Γ_n. Then, see [9], $(f, \Gamma) = (\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, \Gamma_k)$ satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1$'$.

Remark 1.3 *For $(f,\Gamma) = (\sigma_1, \Gamma_1)$, it is the Yamabe problem in the positive case on locally conformally flat manifolds, and the result is due to Schoen ([61], [62]). For $(f,\Gamma) = (\sigma_2^{\frac{1}{2}}, \Gamma_2)$ in dimension $n = 4$, the result was proven without the locally conformally flatness by Chang, Gursky and Yang ([11]). For $(f,\Gamma) = (\sigma_n^{\frac{1}{n}}, \Gamma_n)$, some existence result was established by Viaclovsky ([70]) on a class of manifolds. For $(f,\Gamma) = (\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, \Gamma_k)$, the result was established in our earlier paper [44]; while the existence part for $k \neq \frac{n}{2}$ was independently established by Guan and Wang in [31] using a different method. Guan, Viaclovsky and Wang ([29]) subsequently proven the algebraic fact that $\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma_k$ for $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$ implies the positivity of the Ricci tensor, and therefore (M, g) is conformally covered by $\mathbb{S}^n$, and both existence and compactness results in this case follow from known results. For $(f,\Gamma) = (\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, \Gamma_k)$, $k = 3, 4$ on $4-$dimensional Riemannian manifolds, as well as for $(f,\Gamma) = (\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, \Gamma_k)$, $k = 2, 3$, on $3-$dimensional Riemannian manifolds which are not simply connected , the existence and compactness results are established by Gursky and Viaclovsky in [37].*

Remark 1.4 *If we assume in addition that* $f \in C^{k,\alpha}$ *for some* $k > 4$*, then, by Schauder theory, (12) can be strengthened as*

$$\|u\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(M^n,g)} + \|u^{-1}\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(M^n,g)} \le C,$$

where $C > 0$ *also depends on* k*.*

Since our C^0 and C^1 estimates for solutions of (4) (or, equivalently, of (11)) do not make use of the convexity of V (or concavity of f), we raise the following

Question 1.1 *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1′, but without the concavity assumption on* f*, does there exist a positive Lipschitz function* u *on* M^n *such that* $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ *satisfies (11) in the viscosity sense?*

Equation (11) is a fully nonlinear elliptic equation of u. Fully nonlinear elliptic equations involving $f(\lambda(D^2u))$ have been investigated in the classical and pioneering paper of Caffarelli, Nirenberg and Spruck [9]. Extensive studies and outstanding results on such equations are given by Guan and Spruck [27], Trudinger [67], Trudinger and Wang [68], and many others. Fully nonlinear equations involving $f(\lambda(\nabla_g^2 u + g))$ on Riemannian manifolds are studied by Li [51], Urbas [69], and others. Fully nonlinear equations involving the Schouten tensor have been studied by Viaclovsky in [71] and [70], and by Chang, Gursky and Yang in the remarkable papers [11] and [10]. There have been many papers, preprints, expository articles, and works in preparation, on the subject and related ones, see, e.g., [24], [33], [72] [34], [35], [30], [31], [7], [42], [44], [6], [29], [37], [36], [12], [43], [52], [53], [13], [32], [15], [38], [26] and [49]. The approach developed in our earlier work [44] and continued in the present paper makes use of and extends ideas from previous works on the Yamabe equation by Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg [25], Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck [8], Schoen ([62] and [63]), Li and Zhu ([57]), and Li and Zhang ([54]).

For $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$, we have (see, e.g., [71]),

$$A_{\hat{g}} = -\frac{2}{n-2} u^{-1} \nabla^2 u + \frac{2n}{(n-2)^2} u^{-2} \nabla u \otimes \nabla u - \frac{2}{(n-2)^2} u^{-2} |\nabla u|^2 g + A_g,$$

where covariant derivatives on the right side are with respect to g.

Let $g_1 = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_{flat}$, where g_{flat} denotes the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then, by the above transformation formula,

$$A_{g_1} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} A^u_{ij} dx^i dx^j,$$

where

$$A^u := -\frac{2}{n-2}u^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}\nabla^2 u + \frac{2n}{(n-2)^2}u^{-\frac{2n}{n-2}}\nabla u \otimes \nabla u - \frac{2}{(n-2)^2}u^{-\frac{2n}{n-2}}|\nabla u|^2 I,$$

and I is the $n \times n$ identity matrix. In this case, $\lambda(A_{g_1}) = \lambda(A^u)$ where $\lambda(A^u)$ denotes the eigenvalues of the $n \times n$ symmetric matrix A^u.

Let ψ be a Möbius transformation in $\mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., a transformation generated by translation, multiplication by nonzero constants, and the inversion $x \to x/|x|^2$. For any positive C^2 function u, let $u_\psi := |J_\psi|^{\frac{n-2}{2n}}(u \circ \psi)$ where J_ψ denotes the Jacobian of ψ. A calculation shows that A^{u_ψ} and $A^u \circ \psi$ differ only by an orthogonal conjugation and therefore

$$\lambda(A^{u_\psi}) = \lambda(A^u) \circ \psi. \tag{13}$$

Let $\mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ denote the set of $n \times n$ real symmetric matrices, $O(n)$ denote the set of $n \times n$ real orthogonal matrices, $U \subset \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ be an open set satisfying

$$O^{-1}UO = U, \qquad \forall\, O \in O(n), \tag{14}$$

and let $F \in C^1(U)$ satisfy

$$F(O^{-1}MO) = F(M), \qquad \forall\, M \in U,\ \forall\, O \in O(n), \tag{15}$$

By (13) and (15),

$$F(A^{u_\psi}) \equiv F(A^u) \circ \psi.$$

We proved in [44] that any conformally invariant operator $H(\cdot, u, \nabla u, \nabla^2 u)$, in the sense

$$H(\cdot, u_\psi, \nabla u_\psi, \nabla^2 u_\psi) \equiv H(\cdot, u, \nabla u, \nabla^2 u) \circ \psi,$$

must be of the form $F(A^u)$.

Our next theorem concerns a Harnack type inequality for general conformally invariant equations on locally conformally flat manifolds. Let $\mathcal{S}^{n\times n}_+ \subset \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ denote the set of positive definite matrices. We will assume that U and F further satisfy

$$U \cap \{M + tN \mid 0 < t < \infty\} \text{ is convex} \qquad \forall\, M \in \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}, N \in \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}_+, \tag{16}$$

$$(F_{ij}(M)) > 0, \qquad \forall\, M \in U, \tag{17}$$

where $F_{ij}(M) := \frac{\partial F}{\partial M_{ij}}(M)$, and, for some $\delta > 0$,

$$F(M) \neq 1 \qquad \forall\, M \in U \cap \{M \in \mathcal{S}^{n\times n} \mid \|M\| := (\sum_{i,j} M_{ij}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \delta\}. \tag{18}$$

Theorem 1.2 *For $n \geq 3$, let $U \subset \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ satisfy (14) and (16), and let $F \in C^1(U)$ satisfy (15), (17) and (18). For $R > 0$, let $u \in C^2(B_{3R})$ be a positive solution of*

$$F(A^u) = 1, \quad A^u \in U, \quad in \quad B_{3R}, \tag{19}$$

where B_{3R} denotes the ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of radius $3R$ and centered at the origin. Then

$$(\sup_{B_R} u)(\inf_{B_{2R}} u) \leq C(n)\delta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} R^{2-n}, \tag{20}$$

where $C(n)$ is some constant depending only on n.

Let

$$U_k := \{M \in \mathcal{S}^{n\times n} \mid \lambda(M) \in \Gamma_k\}$$

and

$$F_k(M) = \sigma_k(\lambda(M)), \qquad M \in U_k.$$

For $(F, U) = (F_1, U_1)$, (19) takes the form

$$-\Delta u = \frac{n-2}{2} u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \qquad \text{in } B_{3R}.$$

Remark 1.5 *The Harnack type inequality (20) for $(F, U) = (F_1, U_1)$ was obtained by Schoen in [63]. For a class of nonlinearity including $(F, U) = (F_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, U_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, the Harnack type inequality was established in our earlier work [44].*

Remark 1.6 *In Theorem 1.2, there is no concavity assumption on F and the constant $C(n)$ is given explicitly in the proof. The Harnack type inequalities in [63] and [44] are proved by contradiction arguments which do not yield such an explicit constant.*

Let g be a smooth Riemannian metric on $B_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, and let (f, Γ) satisfy our usual hypotheses. Consider

$$f(\lambda(A_{u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g})) = 1, \quad \lambda(A_{u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g}) \in \Gamma, \qquad \text{in } B_3. \tag{21}$$

Question 1.2 *Are there some positive constants C and δ, depending on (B_3, g) and (f, Γ), such that*

$$(\sup_{B_\epsilon} u)(\inf_{B_{2\epsilon}} u) \leq C\epsilon^{2-n}, \qquad \forall\ 0 < \epsilon \leq \delta,$$

holds for any positive solution of (21)?

Remark 1.7 *The answer to the above question is affirmative for the Yamabe equation (i.e.* $(f, \Gamma) = (\sigma_1, \Gamma_1)$*) in dimension* $n = 3, 4$*, see Li and Zhang [56].*

We have avoided the use of Liouville type theorems in the proofs of Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.1′ and Theorem 1.2. However, in order to solve Conjecture 1.1 on general Riemannian manifolds, to answer Question 1.2, or to study many other issues using fully nonlinear elliptic equations involving the Schouten tensor, it is important to establish the corresponding Liouville type theorems.

For $n \geq 3$, consider

$$-\Delta u = \frac{n-2}{2} u^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \qquad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{22}$$

It was proved by Obata ([60]) and Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg ([25]) that any positive C^2 solution of (22) satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^{\frac{2n}{n-2}} < \infty$ must be of the form

$$u(x) = (2n)^{\frac{n-2}{4}} \left(\frac{a}{1 + a^2 |x - \bar{x}|^2} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}},$$

where $a > 0$ and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The hypothesis $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^{\frac{2n}{n-2}} < \infty$ was removed by Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck ([8]); this is important for applications. The method in [25] is completely different from that of [60]. The method used in our proof of the Liouville type theorems on general conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations (Theorem 1.3) is in the spirit of [25] rather than that of [60]. As in [8], the superharmonicity of the solution has played an important role in our proof of Theorem 1.3, see Lemma 4.1. On the other hand, under some additional hypothesis on the solution near infinity, the superharmonicity of the solution is not needed, see theorem 1.4 in [44].

Somewhat different proofs of the result of Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck were given in [16], [57] and [54]. In particular, the proofs in [57] and [54] fully exploit the conformal invariance of the problem and capture the solutions directly rather than going through the usual procedure of proving radial symmetry of solutions and than classifying radial solutions. A related result of Gidas and Spruck in [27] states that there is no positive solution to the equation $-\Delta u = u^p$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ when $1 < p < \frac{n+2}{n-2}$.

For $n \geq 3$, $-\infty < p \leq \frac{n+2}{n-2}$, we consider the following equation

$$F(A^u) = u^{p - \frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad A^u \in U, \quad u > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{23}$$

For $(F, U) = (F_1, U_1)$, equation (23) takes the form

$$-\Delta u = \frac{n-2}{2} u^p, \quad u > 0, \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Theorem 1.3 *For $n \geq 3$, let $U \subset \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ satisfy (14), (16), and let $F \in C^1(U)$ satisfy (15), (17). Assume that $u \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a superharmonic solution of (23) for some $-\infty < p \leq \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. Then either $u \equiv$ constant or $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ and, for some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and some positive constants a and b satisfying $2b^2a^{-2}I \in U$ and $F(2b^2a^{-2}I) = 1$,*

$$u(x) \equiv \left(\frac{a}{1+b^2|x-\bar{x}|^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}, \quad \forall\ x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{24}$$

Remark 1.8 *For $(F,U) = (F_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, U_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, a solution of (23) is automatically superharmonic.*

Remark 1.9 *The more difficult case is for $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. When $(F,U) = (F_1, U_1)$, the result in this case (the rest of this remark also refers to this case), as mentioned earlier, was established by Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck ([8]); while under some additional hypothesis the result was proved by Obata ([60]) and Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg ([25]). For $(F,U) = (F_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, U_k)$, and under some strong hypothesis on u near infinity, the result was proved by Viaclovsky ([71] and [72]). For $(F,U) = (F_2^{\frac{1}{2}}, U_2)$ in dimension $n = 4$, the result was due to Chang, Gursky and Yang ([11]). For $(F,U) = (F_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, U_k)$, the result was established in our earlier paper [44]; while for $(F,U) = (F_2^{\frac{1}{2}}, U_2)$ in dimension $n = 5$, as well as for $(F,U) = (F_2^{\frac{1}{2}}, U_2)$ in dimension $n \geq 6$ under an additional hypothesis $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u^{\frac{2n}{n-2}} < \infty$, the result was independently established by Chang, Gursky and Yang ([14]). Under some fairly strong hypothesis (but weaker than that used in [71] and [72]) on u near infinity, the result was proved in [44] without the superharmonicity assumption on u.*

If we let (M^n, g) denote some smooth compact $n-$dimensional Riemannian manifold *with boundary*, an analogous problem is to find conformal metrics with constant scalar curvature and constant boundary mean curvature. The problem has been studied by many authors, see, e.g., Cherrier ([17]), Escobar ([19], [20], [21] and [22]), Han and Li ([39] and [40]), Ambrosetti, Malchiodi and Li ([1]), Brendle ([5]), and the references therein. This boundary Yamabe problem is called of positive type if the first eigenvalue of

$$\begin{cases} -L_g\varphi &= \lambda\varphi, \qquad \text{in } M^\circ, \\ \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu} + \frac{n-2}{2}h_g\varphi &= 0, \qquad \quad \text{on } \partial M \end{cases}$$

is positive, where h_g denotes the mean curvature.

Now we consider an extension of the boundary Yamabe problem of positive type to the fully nonlinear setting:

Question 1.3 *Assume that* V *is an open symmetric convex subset of* $\mathbb{R}^n$, *with* $\emptyset \neq \partial V \in C^\infty$ *satisfying (1) and (2). Let* (M^n, g) *be a compact smooth Riemannian manifold with boundary satisfying*

$$\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma(V), \qquad \text{on } \overline{M},$$

and let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ *be any constant. Does there exist a smooth positive function* $u \in C^\infty(\overline{M})$ *such that the conformal metric* $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ *satisfies (5) and the boundary mean curvature* $h_{\hat{g}}$ *satisfies*

$$h_{\hat{g}} = c \qquad \text{on } \partial M?$$

To answer Question 1.3, it is important to investigate the corresponding Liouville type problem on half Euclidean space. Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 below provide such Liouville type theorems.

We use $B_R(x)$ to denote the ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of radius R and centered at x, and write $B_R = B_R(0)$. Let $\mathbb{R}^n_+ = \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n |\ x_n > 0\}$ and $B_1^+ = B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}^n_+$. Consider, for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{cases} F(A^u) = 1, \quad A^u \in U, \quad u > 0, & \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n} = c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}}, & \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Our first result is under the assumption that the solution has good behavior near infinity.

Theorem 1.4 *For* $n \geq 3$, *let* $U \subset \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ *be an open set satisfying (14) and (16), and let* $F \in C^1(U)$ *satisfy (15) and (17). For* $c \in \mathbb{R}$, *we assume that* $u \in C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+})$ *is a solution of (25) satisfying, for* $u_{0,1}(x) := |x|^{2-n} u(\frac{x}{|x|^2})$,

$$u_{0,1} \quad \text{can be extended to a positive continuous function in} \quad \overline{B_1^+}, \tag{26}$$

$$\limsup_{x\to 0}(x \cdot \nabla u_{0,1}(x)) < \frac{n-2}{2} u_{0,1}(0),$$

and

$$\lim_{x\to 0}(|x|^2 \nabla u_{0,1}(x)) = 0.$$

Then

$$u(x', x_n) \equiv \left(\frac{a}{1 + b|(x', x_n) - (\bar{x}', \bar{x}_n)|^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+, \tag{27}$$

where $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}', \bar{x}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $a > 0$ *and* $b + (\min \bar{x}_n, 0)^2 > 0$ *are two constants satisfying* $2a^{-2}bI \in U$, $F(2a^{-2}bI) = 1$ *and* $(n-2)a^{-1}b\bar{x}_n = c$.

Remark 1.10 *In the above theorem, we do not assume u to be superharmonic.*

Corollary 1.1 *For $n \geq 3$, let $U \subset \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ be an open set satisfying (14) and (16), and let $F \in C^1(U)$ satisfy (15) and (17). Assume that $u \in C^2(\overline{B_1})$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} F(A^u) = 1, \quad A^u \in U, \quad u > 0, & \text{in } \overline{B_1}, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} + \frac{n-2}{2} u = -c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}}, & \text{on } \partial B_1, \end{cases}$$

where ν denotes the unit outer normal on ∂B_1. Then u is of the form

$$u(x) \equiv \left(\frac{a}{1+b|x|^2}\right)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \quad \text{in } B_1, \tag{28}$$

where a, b, c satisfy

$$a > 0, \quad \frac{2b}{a^2} I \in U, \quad F\left(\frac{2b}{a^2} I\right) = 1, \quad \frac{n-2}{2}(1-b) = -ca.$$

Our next Liouville type theorem does not require any hypothesis on the solution near infinity.

Theorem 1.5 *For $n \geq 3$, let $U \subset \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ be an open set satisfying (14) and (16), and let $F \in C^1(U)$ satisfy (15) and (17). Assume that*

$$0 \notin \overline{F^{-1}(1)}. \tag{29}$$

For $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we assume that $u \in C^2(\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+})$ is a solution of (25) satisfying,

$$\Delta u \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

Then u is of form (27) with $\bar{x}, a$ and b given below (27).

Remark 1.11 *For $c \leq 0$, the assumption (29) is not needed. This can be seen in the proof.*

Remark 1.12 *$(F, U) = (F_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, U_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, satisfy the hypotheses of the theorem.*

Remark 1.13 *For $(F, U) = (F_1, U_1)$, the result was proved by Li and Zhu [57]; while under an additional hypothesis $u(x) = O(|x|^{2-n})$ for large $|x|$, the solutions were classified by Escobar [19].*

Our proofs of Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 make use of the following result concerning radially symmetric solutions.

Theorem 1.6 *For* $n \geq 3$*, let* $U \subset \mathcal{S}^{n\times n}$ *be an open set satisfying (14), and let* $F \in C^1(U)$ *satisfy (15) and (17). Assume that* $u \in C^2(B_1)$ *is radially symmetric and satisfies*

$$F(A^u) = 1, \quad A^u \in U, \quad u > 0, \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Then u *is of the form (28) with* $a > 0$, $b \geq -1$, $\frac{2b}{a^2} I \in U$ *and* $F(\frac{2b}{a^2} I) = 1$.

In the following we state some of the results in a forthcoming paper [49]. First, an existence and compactness result on subcritical equations:

Theorem 1.7 *Let* (M, g) *be a smooth, compact, connected Riemannian manifold of dimension* $n \geq 3$*, and let* $1 < 1 + \epsilon \leq p \leq \frac{n+2}{n-2} - \epsilon < \frac{n+2}{n-2}$*. Then there exists a positive solution* $u \in C^\infty(M)$ *to*

$$\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}(A_{u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g}) = u^{p - \frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad \text{on } M. \tag{30}$$

Moreover all positive solutions of (30) satisfy, for all $m \geq 2$,

$$\|u\|_{C^m(M,g)} + \|\frac{1}{u}\|_{C^m(M,g)} \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ *depends only on* (M^n, g), ϵ *and* m.

Remark 1.14 *For* $k = 1$*, this is well known.*

Next, a Harnack type inequality on half Euclidean balls:

Theorem 1.8 *For* $n \geq 3$ *and* $R > 0$*, let* $u \in C^2(\overline{B_{3R}^+})$ *be a solution of the equation*

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}(A^u) = 1, & \text{in } B_{3R}^+ := B_{3R} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n. \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n} = c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}}, & \text{on } \partial B_{3R}^+ \cap \partial \mathbb{R}_+^n \quad \text{for some constant } c. \\ u > 0, \ A^u \in \Gamma_k, & \text{on } \overline{B_{3R}^+}. \end{cases}$$

Then there exists some constant $C > 0$ *depending only on* n *and* c *such that*

$$(\sup_{B_R^+} u)(\inf_{\partial B_{2R}^+} u) \leq C R^{2-n}.$$

Remark 1.15 *For $k = 1$, this, as well as a stronger form, is established by Li and Zhang in [54] (see theorem 1.7 and remark 1.11 there).*

Remark 1.16 *Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.8 hold for more general (f, Γ) (see [49]).*

As mentioned earlier, Theorem 1.1′ in the case $(f, \Gamma) = (\sigma_1, \Gamma_1)$ is the Yamabe problem in the positive case on locally conformally flat manifolds, and the result is due to Schoen ([61] and [62]). The proof in [62] has three main ingredients: The first is the existence of the developing map due to Schoen and Yau [64], the second is the use of the method of moving planes, and the third is the Liouville type theorem of Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck [8]. A major difficulty in extending the result for $(f, \Gamma) = (\sigma_1, \Gamma_1)$ to fully nonlinear (f, Γ) was the lack of corresponding Liouville type theorem. An important step was taken by Zhang and the second author in [54] which gives a proof of Schoen′s Harnack type inequality for the Yamabe equation without using the Liouville type theorem in [8]. Adapting this idea, we established in [44] (theorem 1.27 there) the Harnack type inequality (20) for a class of nonlinearity including $(F, U) = (F_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, U_k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, under the circumstance that the corresponding Liouville type theorem was not available. This also made us recognize the possibility of proving Theorem 1.1′ without the corresponding Liouville type theorem. Indeed we have developed in [44] an approach, based on the method of moving spheres (i.e. the method of moving planes together with the conformal invariance of the problem), to prove the existence and compactness results for the fully nonlinear version of the Yamabe problem on locally conformally flat manifolds under the circumstance that the corresponding Liouville type theorem was not available. Another major difficulty in proving Theorem 1.1′ is the lack of C^0 and C^1 estimates of solutions. We have developed a new approach in [44], again based on the method of moving spheres, to obtain such estimates. We have also introduced in [44] a homotopy which connects the general fully nonlinear version of the Yamabe problem to the Yamabe problem and used the degree for second order fully nonlinear elliptic operators in [50] and the result in [62] for the Yamabe problem to prove the existence of solutions to the fully nonlinear ones.

In [28] Guan, Lin and Wang have also presented a proof of Theorem 1.2 under an additional concavity hypothesis on F and of Theorem 1.1′. We clarify these overlaps in this paragraph: First, these results follow immediately from our earlier work [44] and Lemma 6.2 —- a quantitative version of a calculus lemma used repeatedly in [44]. Second we completed the proof of these results earlier. Indeed, the only change one needs to make is to move the four lines below (4.3) on page 1446 of [44] to be right after line 5 of the same page. After making this change, the gradient estimate stated on line 7 of the same page follows from Lemma 6.2, and Theorem 1.2 under an additional concavity hypothesis on F and Theorem 1.1$'$, as well as our new C^0 and C^1 estimates, follow from the proofs of theorem 1.25 and theorem 1.27 in [44]. We did not see the elementary proof of Lemma 6.2 at the time of submitting [44] to the journal, but proved it soon afterwards. Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.1$'$, with an emphasis on our new C^0 and C^1 estimates based on the method of moving planes, were presented by the second author in his 45$-$minute invited talk at ICM 2002 in August 2002 in Beijing. Told us by C.S. Lin that he started to work with G. Wang in October-November 2002 which led to [28] where a proof of Theorem 1.2 under an additional concavity hypothesis on F and Theorem 1.1$'$ is included. The proof, following [44] (in particular following the above mentioned steps developed there), provides the only ingredient beyond [44] which, as explained above, amounts to the calculus lemma (Lemma 6.2). We present the proof of Theorem 1.1$'$ and Theorem 1.2 in Section 2 and Section 3 respectively. The proof of Theorem 1.1$'$, appeared in slightly shorter form in [43] and in preprint form [45], contains one slight simplification to the arguments in [44] which avoids the use of local C^2 estimates (only global C^2 estimates are needed); while the proof of Theorem 1.2, also appeared in slightly shorter form in [43] and in [45], contains one more ingredient to remove the concavity assumption on F which also yields an explicit constant $C(n)$ in (20).

Due to Theorem 1.1$'$ (or Theorem 1.1), Conjecture 1.1$'$ (or Conjecture 1.1) mainly concerns the problem on Riemannian manifolds which are not locally conformally flat. In general, Equation (11) does not have a variational formulation. A plausible approach is to establish a priori estimates (12) for all solutions of (11), and to use the homotopy in [44] to connect the problem to the Yamabe problem. For the Yamabe problem (i.e. (11) for $(f,\Gamma)=(\sigma_1,\Gamma_1)$), such estimate was given by Li and Zhu [57] in dimension $n=3$; the estimate in dimension $n=4$ follows from a combination of the results of Li and Zhang [56] and Druet [18]; Li and Zhang have extended the estimate to dimension $n\le 7$, as well as to dimension $n\ge 8$ but under an additional hypothesis that the Weyl tensor of g is nowhere vanishing, see [55]. The Liouville type theorem of Caffarelli, Gidas and Spruck has played an important role in the proof of this result. It is clear that Theorem 1.3 will also play an important role in proving Conjecture 1.1$'$.

The main difficulty in proving Theorem 1.3 is to remove the possible isolated singularity of u at infinity. By the conformal invariance of the problem, we may assume that the isolated singularity is at 0 instead of at infinity. The following analytical issue is relevant: Let $u\in C^\infty(B_1\setminus\{0\})$ and $v\in C^\infty(B_1)$ be positive solutions of

$$F(A^u)=1,\quad A^u\in U,\qquad \text{in } B_1\setminus\{0\},$$

and

$$F(A^v) = 1, \quad A^v \in U, \qquad \text{in } B_1,$$

satisfying

$$u > v \qquad \text{in } B_1 \setminus \{0\}.$$

Is it true that

$$\liminf_{|x| \to 0} (u(x) - v(x)) > 0?$$

If the answer to the above question were "yes", then the proof of theorem 1.4 in [44] would yield a proof of Theorem 1.3 for $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. So far, the answer to the question is not known even for $(F, U) = (F_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, U_k)$, $2 \le k \le n$. The answer to the question is "yes" for $(F, U) = (F_1, U_1)$ due to some elementary properties of superharmonic functions in a punctured ball. As far as we know, the isolated singularity issue encountered in the application of the method of moving plane has always been handled by providing an affirmative answer to a local question like the above. Our proof of Theorem 1.3 avoids this local question by exploiting global information of u, through a delicate use of Lemma 4.1. The proof of Theorem 1.3 also fully exploits the conformal invariance of the problem and captures the solutions directly rather then going through the usual procedure of proving radial symmetry of solutions and than classifying radial solutions. Two proofs of Theorem 1.3 appeared in preprint forms in [47] and [48]. We present in Section 4 the proof in [48]. Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5, some Liouville type theorems on half Euclidean spaces, are extensions of theorem 1.4 in [44] and Theorem 1.3 respectively. The proofs are given in Section 5.

Acknowledgment. Part of this paper was completed while the second author was a visiting member at the Institute for Advanced Study in Fall 2003. He thanks J. Bourgain and IAS for providing him the excellent environment, as well as for providing him the financial support through NSF-DMS-0111298. Part of the work of the second author is also supported by NSF-DMS-0100819.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.1$'$.

In Appendix B, we deduce the equivalence of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.1$'$., therefore we only need to prove one of the two theorems.

Proof of Theorem 1.1$'$. Without loss of generality, we further assume f is homogeneous of degree 1. Indeed, in Appendix B, we construct a new function $\tilde{f}$

which is homogeneous of degree 1, satisfies the same assumptions as f does, and $\tilde{f}^{-1}(1) = f^{-1}(1)$.

We first establish (12). Let $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ be the universal cover of (M^n, g), with $i : \widetilde{M} \to M^n$ being a covering map and $\widetilde{g} = i^* g$. It is well-known that there exists a conformal immersion

$$\Phi : (\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g}) \to (\mathbb{S}^n, g_0),$$

where g_0 denotes the standard metric on $\mathbb{S}^n$. By $\lambda(A_g) \in \Gamma$ and the assumption $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_1$, we have $R_g > 0$. Hence by a deep theorem of Schoen and Yau in [64], Φ is injective. Let

$$\Omega = \Phi(\widetilde{M}).$$

Claim 2.1

$$\frac{1}{C} \le u \le C, \quad |\nabla_g u| \le C \qquad \text{on } M^n,$$

where $u \in C^2(M^n)$ *is an arbitrary positive solution of (11) with* $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$ *and* $C > 0$ *is some constant depending only on* (M^n, g) *and* (f, Γ).

For convenience, we introduce

$$U = \{A \in \mathcal{S}^{n\times n} \mid \lambda(A) \in \Gamma\},$$

and

$$F(A) = f(\lambda(A)), \qquad A \in U.$$

We distinguish two cases.

Case 1.

$$\Omega = \mathbb{S}^n;$$

Case 2.

$$\Omega \ne \mathbb{S}^n.$$

In Case 1, $(\Phi^{-1})^* \widetilde{g} = \eta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_0$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$, where η is a positive smooth function on $\mathbb{S}^n$. Let $\tilde{u} = u \circ i$. Since $F\left(A_{\tilde{u}^{\frac{4}{n-2}} \widetilde{g}}\right) = 1$ on $\widetilde{M}$, we have

$$F\left(A_{[(\tilde{u}\circ\Phi^{-1})\eta]^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_0}\right) = 1, \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n.$$

By corollary 1.6 in [44], $(\tilde{u} \circ \Phi^{-1})\eta = a|J_\varphi|^{\frac{n-2}{2n}}$ for some positive constant a and some conformal diffeomorphism $\varphi : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{S}^n$. Since $\varphi^* g_0 = |J_\varphi|^{\frac{2}{n}} g_0$, we have, by the above equation, that

$$f(a^{-\frac{4}{n-2}}(n-1)e) = f(a^{-\frac{4}{n-2}} \lambda(A_{g_0})) = 1,$$

where $e = (1, \cdots, 1)$. By (10) and the concavity of f, we know $\nabla f(\lambda) \cdot \lambda > 0$ for any $\lambda \in \Gamma$. Thus $f|_{\partial\Gamma} = 0$ and (10) implies a is a constant uniquely determined by (f, Γ).

Fix a compact subset E of $\widetilde{M}$ such that $i(E) = M^n$. Since (M^n, g) is not conformally diffeomorphic to $(\mathbb{S}^n, g_0)$, so $\pi_1(M^n)$ is nontrivial. Let $\tilde{x}^{(1)} \in E$ and $\tilde{x}^{(2)} \in \widetilde{M}$ be two distinct points satisfying $\tilde{u}(\tilde{x}^{(1)}) = \tilde{u}(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) = \max_{M^n} u$. Then

$$dist_{g_0}\left(\Phi(\tilde{x}^{(1)}), \Phi(\tilde{x}^{(2)})\right) \geq \frac{1}{C}.$$

Consequently,

$$\min\{|J_\varphi(\Phi(\tilde{x}^{(1)})|, |J_\varphi(\Phi(\tilde{x}^{(2)})|\} \leq C,$$

from which we deduce that

$$\min\{\tilde{u}(\tilde{x}^{(1)})\eta(\Phi(\tilde{x}^{(1)})), \tilde{u}(\tilde{x}^{(2)})\eta(\Phi(\tilde{x}^{(2)}))\} \leq C.$$

It follows that

$$\max_{M^n} u = \tilde{u}(\tilde{x}^{(1)}) = \tilde{u}(\tilde{x}^{(2)}) \leq C.$$

Moreover, we also know from the above and the formula of $\tilde{u}$ that

$$|J_\varphi| \leq C \qquad \text{on } \mathbb{S}^n,$$

from which we deduce that

$$\||J_\varphi|\|_{C^m(\mathbb{S}^n, g_0)} + \|\frac{1}{|J_\varphi|}\|_{C^m(\mathbb{S}^n, g_0)} \leq C(m)$$

and therefore

$$\|u\|_{C^m(M^n, g)} + \|u^{-1}\|_{C^m(M^n, g)} \leq C$$

for some C depending only on (M, g), (f, Γ) and m. Estimates (12) is established in this case.

In Case 2, by the result in [64], $\Omega = \Phi(\tilde{M})$ is an open and dense subset of $\mathbb{S}^n$, $(\Phi^{-1})^* \tilde{g} = \eta^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g_0$ on Ω, where η is a positive smooth function in Ω satisfying $\lim_{z \to \partial\Omega} \eta(z) = \infty$. Let $u(x) = \max_{M^n} u$ for some $x \in M^n$, and let $i(\tilde{x}) = x$ for some $\tilde{x} \in E$. By composing with a rotation of $\mathbb{S}^n$, we may assume without loss of generality that $\Phi(\tilde{x}) = S$, the south pole of $\mathbb{S}^n$. Let $P : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be the stereographic projection, and let v be the positive function on the open subset $P(\Omega)$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ determined by

$(P^{-1})^*(\eta^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g_0) = v^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g_{flat}$, where g_{flat} denotes the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then for some $\epsilon > 0$, depending only on (M^n, g), we have

$$B_{9\epsilon} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |x| < 9\epsilon\} \subset P(\Omega),$$

and

$$dist_{flat}(P(\Phi(E)), \partial P(\Omega)) > 9\epsilon.$$

On $P(\Omega)$,

$$F(A^{\hat{u}}) = 1, \qquad \lambda(A^{\hat{u}}) \in \Gamma,$$

where $\hat{u} = (\tilde{u} \circ \Phi^{-1} \circ P^{-1})v$.

By the property of η, we know that

$$\lim_{P(\Omega) \ni y \to \bar{y} \in \partial P(\Omega)} \hat{u}(y) = \infty, \tag{31}$$

and, if the north pole of S^n does not belong to Ω,

$$\lim_{y \in P(\Omega), |y| \to \infty} (|y|^{n-2}\hat{u}(y)) = \infty. \tag{32}$$

For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $dist_{flat}(x, P(\Phi(E))) < 2\epsilon$, we can perform a moving sphere argument as in the corresponding part in [44] (for w_j there) to show that, $\forall\ 0 < \lambda < 4\epsilon, |y - x| \geq \lambda,\ y \in P(\Omega)$,

$$\hat{u}_{x,\lambda}(y) := \frac{\lambda^{n-2}}{|y-x|^{n-2}}\hat{u}(\frac{\lambda^2(y-x)}{|y-x|^2}) \leq \hat{u}(y). \tag{33}$$

When proving the above, there is some minor difference between the north pole of S^n, $N \in \Omega$ and $N \notin \Omega$. If $N \notin \Omega$, then by (32), there is no worry about "touching at infinity" in the moving sphere procedure. If $N \in \Omega$, then ∞ is a regular point of $\hat{u}$ (i.e., $|z|^{2-n}\hat{u}(\frac{z}{|z|^2})$ can be extended as a C^2 positive function near $z = 0$) and therefore by the strong maximum principle argument as in [44], if "touching at infinity" occurs, $(\hat{u})_{x,\lambda}$ would coincide with $\hat{u}$ in the unbounded connected component of $P(\Omega)$ for some $0 < \lambda < 4\epsilon$, which violates (31) since $(\hat{u})_{x,\lambda}$ is apparently bounded near any point of $\partial P(\Omega)$.

By Lemma 6.2 in Appendix A, we deduce from (33) that

$$|\nabla(log\hat{u})(y)| \leq C(\epsilon) \quad \forall\ dist_{flat}(y, P(\Phi(E))) < \epsilon.$$

It follows, for some C depending only on (M^n, g), that

$$|\nabla_g \log u| \leq C \qquad \text{on } M^n.$$

Hence Claim (2.1) follows directly from the bounds below

$$\min_{M^n} u \le C, \quad \max_{M^n} u \ge \frac{1}{C} \quad \text{for some universal constant } C. \tag{34}$$

To establish (34), let $u(\bar{x}) = \min_{M^n} u$. At $\bar{x}$, by $\nabla u(\bar{x}) = 0$, $(\nabla^2 u(\bar{x})) \ge 0$, and (9), we have

$$1 = f(\lambda(A_{\hat{g}})) \le f(u^{\frac{-4}{n-2}} \lambda(A_g)),$$

which implies, by $f|_{\partial\Gamma} = 0$ and $f \in C^0(\bar{\Gamma})$, that $u^{\frac{-4}{n-2}}(\bar{x}) \ge C$, i.e., $u(\bar{x}) \le C$. Similarly, by properties of f (in particular (10)), we can establish $\max_{M^n} u \ge \frac{1}{C}$. The C^2 estimate of u has been established in [44] (see also [70] for the estimates for $(f, \Gamma) = (\sigma_k^{\frac{1}{k}}, \Gamma_k)$). The C^2 estimate of u^{-1} follows in view of Claim 2.1.

Thus when (M^n, g) is not conformally diffeomorphic to a standard sphere, we have proved that any positive solution of (11) satisfies, for some constant C depending only on (M^n, g) and (f, Γ),

$$\|u\|_{C^2(M^n,g)} + \|u^{-1}\|_{C^2(M^n,g)} \le C.$$

Since f is concave in Γ, $C^{2,\alpha}$ and higher order derivative estimates follow from a theorem of Evans ([23]) and Krylov ([41]), and the Schauder estimate.

To establish the existence part of Theorem 1.1′, we only need to treat the case that (M^n, g) is not conformally diffeomorphic to a standard sphere since it is obvious otherwise. We use the following homotopy introduced in [44]. For $0 \le t \le 1$, let

$$f_t(\lambda) = f\left(t\lambda + (1-t)\sigma_1(\lambda) e\right),$$

be defined on

$$\Gamma_t := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid t\lambda + (1-t)\sigma_1(\lambda)e \in \Gamma\},$$

where $e = (1, 1, \cdots, 1)$.

Consider, for $0 \le t \le 1$,

$$f_t(\lambda(A_{\hat{g}})) = 1, \quad \lambda(A_{\hat{g}}) \in \Gamma_t, \qquad \text{on } M^n. \tag{35}$$

Here and below $\hat{g} = u^{\frac{4}{n-2}} g$.

By the a priori estimates we have just established, there exists some constant $C > 0$ independent of $t \in [0, 1]$ such that for all solutions u of (35),

$$\|u\|_{C^{4,\alpha}}(M^n, g) + \|u^{-1}\|_{C^{4,\alpha}}(M^n, g) \le C. \tag{36}$$

By (36) and the assumption $f|_{\partial\Gamma} = 0$, $\exists\ \delta > 0$ independent of $t \in [0,1]$ such that all solutions u of (35) satisfy

$$dist(\lambda(A_{\hat{g}}), \partial\Gamma_t) \geq 2\delta.$$

Define, for $0 \leq t \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} O_t^* = \{u \in C^{4,\alpha}(M^n) \quad | \quad & \lambda(A_{\hat{g}}) \in \Gamma_t,\ dist(\lambda(A_{\hat{g}}), \partial\Gamma_t) > \delta, \\ & u > 0,\ \|u\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g)} + \|u^{-1}\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g)} < 2C\}, \end{aligned}$$

where C is the constant in (36). By [50],

$$d_t := \deg\left(F_t - 1, O_t^*, 0\right), \qquad 0 \leq t \leq 1,$$

is well defined, where $F_t[u] := f_t(\lambda(A_{\hat{g}})) - 1$, and

$$d_t \equiv d_0, \qquad 0 \leq t \leq 1.$$

In particular,

$$d_1 = d_0.$$

The equation (35) for $t = 0$ is the Yamabe equation. By the result of Schoen in [62] for the Yamabe problem, $d_0 = -1$. Thus $d_1 \neq 0$ and equation (11) has a solution. Theorem 1.1′ is established.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Part of the proof of this theorem is taken from [44], which we include here for reader′s convenience. We only need to prove the theorem for $R = \delta = 1$. Indeed, let

$$\tilde{F}(M) := F(\delta M), \quad \tilde{U} := \delta^{-1}U, \quad \text{and} \ \ \tilde{u}(x) := \delta^{\frac{n-2}{4}} R^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u(Rx).$$

Then

$$\tilde{F}(A^{\tilde{u}}) = 1, \quad A^{\tilde{u}} \in \tilde{U}, \quad \text{in} \quad B_3,$$

and $(\tilde{F}, \tilde{U})$ satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 1.2 with $R = \delta = 1$. Thus, once we have established the theorem in the case $R = \delta = 1$, we have

$$(\sup_{B_R} u)(\inf_{B_{2R}} u) = \delta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} R^{2-n} (\sup_{B_1} \tilde{u})(\inf_{B_2} \tilde{u}) \leq C\delta^{\frac{2-n}{2}} R^{2-n}.$$

Thus we assume in the following $R = \delta = 1$. Let $u(\bar{x}) = \max_{\bar{B}_1} u$. As in the proof of theorem 1.27 in [44],we can find $\tilde{x} \in B_{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{x})$ such that

$$u(\tilde{x}) \geq 2^{\frac{2-n}{2}} \sup_{B_\sigma(\tilde{x})} u$$

and

$$\gamma := u(\tilde{x})^{\frac{2}{n-2}} \sigma \geq \frac{1}{2} u(\bar{x})^{\frac{2}{n-2}}, \tag{37}$$

where $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}(1 - |\tilde{x} - \bar{x}|) \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

If

$$\gamma \leq 2^{n+8} n^4,$$

then

$$(\sup_{B_1} u)(\inf_{B_2} u) \leq u(\bar{x})^2 \leq (2\gamma)^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \leq C(n),$$

and we are done. So we always assume that

$$\gamma > 2^{n+8} n^4.$$

Let $\Gamma := u(\tilde{x})^{\frac{2}{n-2}} \geq 2\gamma$, and consider

$$w(y) := \frac{1}{u(\tilde{x})} u\Big(\tilde{x} + \frac{y}{u(\tilde{x})^{\frac{2}{n-2}}}\Big), \quad |y| < \Gamma.$$

Clearly

$$\min_{\partial B_\Gamma} w \geq \frac{1}{u(\tilde{x})} \inf_{B_2} u, \tag{38}$$

$$1 = w(0) \geq 2^{\frac{2-n}{2}} \sup_{B_\gamma} w. \tag{39}$$

By the conformal invariance of the equation satisfied by u,

$$F(A^w) = 1, \qquad w > 0, \qquad \text{on } B_\Gamma.$$

Fix

$$r = 2^{n+6} n^4 < \frac{1}{4}\gamma.$$

$\forall |x| < r$, consider

$$w_{x,\lambda}(y) := (\frac{\lambda}{|y-x|})^{n-2} w(x + \frac{\lambda^2 (y-x)}{|y-x|^2}).$$

By the conformal invariance of the equation, we have

$$F(A^{w_{x,\lambda}}) = 1, \qquad w_{x,\lambda} > 0, \qquad \text{on } B_\Gamma \setminus B_\lambda(x), \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \frac{3\gamma}{4}.$$

As in [44], there exists $0 < \lambda_x < r$ such that we have

$$w_{x,\lambda}(y) \le w(y), \qquad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_x,\ y \in B_\Gamma \setminus B_\lambda(x),$$

and

$$w_{x,\lambda}(y) < w(y), \qquad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_x,\ y \in \partial B_\Gamma.$$

By the moving sphere argument as in [44], we only need to consider the following two cases:
Case 1. For some $|x| < r$ and some $\lambda \in (0, r)$, $w_{x,\lambda}$ touches w on ∂B_Γ.
Case 2. For all $|x| < r$ and all $\lambda \in (0, r)$, we have

$$w_{x,\lambda}(y) \le w(y), \quad \forall\ |y - x| \ge \lambda,\ y \in B_\Gamma.$$

In Case 1, let $\lambda \in (0, r)$ be the smallest number for which $w_{x,\lambda}$ touches w on ∂B_Γ. By (38), we have, for some $|y_0| = \Gamma$,

$$\frac{1}{u(\tilde{x})} \inf_{B_2} u \le \min_{\partial B_\Gamma} w = w_{x,\lambda}(y_0).$$

Recall (39),

$$w_{x,\lambda}(y_0) \le \Big(\frac{\lambda}{|y_0 - x|}\Big)^{n-2} \sup_{B_\gamma} w \le 2^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \Big(\frac{\lambda}{|y_0 - x|}\Big)^{n-2} \le 2^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \Big(\frac{r}{\Gamma - r}\Big)^{n-2}.$$

Therefore

$$\sigma^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u(\tilde{x}) \inf_{B_2} u \le 2^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \sigma^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u(\tilde{x})^2 \Big(\frac{r}{\Gamma - r}\Big)^{n-2}.$$

Since $4r < \gamma \le \frac{\Gamma}{2}$ and $\sigma \le \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\sigma^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u(\tilde{x}) \inf_{B_2} u \le 2^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \sigma^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u(\tilde{x})^2 \frac{r^{n-2}}{(\frac{1}{2}\Gamma)^{n-2}} = 2^{\frac{3}{2}(n-2)} \sigma^{\frac{n-2}{2}} r^{n-2} \le 2^{n-2} r^{n-2}. \tag{40}$$

We deduce from (37) and (40) that

$$(\sup_{B_1} u)(\inf_{B_2} u) \le 4^{n-2} r^{n-2} \le C(n).$$

In Case 2, we have, by Lemma 6.2 and (39), that

$$|\nabla w(y)| \le 2(n-2)r^{-1}w(y) \le (n-2)2^{\frac{n}{2}}r^{-1}, \quad \forall |y| \le r.$$

Let ϵ be the number such that

$$\xi(y) := \frac{1-\epsilon}{r}(r - |y|^2), \qquad |y| < \sqrt{r}$$

satisfies

$$w \ge \xi, \quad \text{on } B_{\sqrt{r}},$$

and, for some $|\bar{y}| < \sqrt{r}$,

$$w(\bar{y}) = \xi(\bar{y}).$$

Since $1 = w(0) \ge \xi(0) = 1 - \epsilon$ and $w(\bar{y}) > 0$, we have $0 \le \epsilon < 1$.

By the estimates of $|\nabla w|$ and the mean value theorem,

$$|w(y) - 1| = |w(y) - w(0)| \le (n-2)2^{\frac{n}{2}}r^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad \forall\ |y| \le \sqrt{r}.$$

So

$$1 - (n-2)2^{\frac{n}{2}}r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \le w(\bar{y}) = \xi(\bar{y}) \le 1 - \epsilon,$$

and therefore

$$0 \le \epsilon \le (n-2)2^{\frac{n}{2}}r^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Clearly,

$$\nabla w(\bar{y}) = \nabla \xi(\bar{y}), \;\; |\nabla \xi(\bar{y})| \le \frac{2}{\sqrt{r}}, \;\; D^2 w(\bar{y}) \ge D^2 \xi(\bar{y}) = -2(1-\epsilon)r^{-1}I.$$

It follows that

$$A^w(\bar{y}) \le A^{\xi}(\bar{y}) \le \frac{(10n+4)}{(n-2)^2}2^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}r^{-1}I.$$

Since $F(A^w(\bar{y})) = 1$, we have, by (18) (recall that $\delta = 1$), $\frac{(10n+4)}{(n-2)^2}2^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}r^{-1} \ge 1$, violating the choice of r. Thus we have shown that Case 2 can never occur. Theorem 1.2 is established.

$\square$

4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Lemma 4.1 *For $n \geq 2$, $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $u \in L^1_{loc}(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ be the solution of*

$$\Delta u \leq 0 \qquad in\ B_1 \setminus \{0\}$$

in the distribution sense. Assume $\exists\ a \in R$ and $p \neq q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$u(x) \geq \max\{a + p \cdot x - \delta(x), a + q \cdot x - \delta(x)\} \quad \forall x \in\ B_1 \setminus \{0\},$$

where $\delta(x) \geq 0$ satisfies $\lim\limits_{x \to 0} \frac{\delta(x)}{|x|} = 0$. Then

$$\lim_{r \to 0} \inf_{B_r} u > a.$$

Proof. Let

$$v(x) := a + p \cdot x - \delta(x), \quad w(x) := a + q \cdot x - \delta(x), \quad \forall x \in B_1.$$

By subtracting $a + p \cdot x$ from u, v, w respectively, we can assume $a = 0$ and $p = 0$. After a rotation and a dilation of the coordinates, we can also assume $\nabla w(0) = e_1$.

Let $u_\epsilon := \frac{1}{\epsilon} u(\epsilon \cdot)$, $v_\epsilon := \frac{1}{\epsilon} v(\epsilon \cdot)$, and $w_\epsilon := \frac{1}{\epsilon} w(\epsilon \cdot)$. We have

$$v_\epsilon(x) = o(1), \quad w_\epsilon(x) = x_1 + o(1),$$

where $o(1) \to 0$ uniformly on $\bar{B}_1$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. $\forall \bar{\delta} > 0$, by $u_\epsilon \geq v_\epsilon$, $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$u_\epsilon(x) \geq -\bar{\delta} \quad \text{in } B_1, \quad \forall\ \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0.$$

By $u_\epsilon \geq w_\epsilon$, we have $u_\epsilon \geq c_0 > 0$ on $\Omega := B_{\frac{1}{4}}(\frac{1}{2} e_1)$ for some universal constant c_0 independent of $\bar{\delta}$ and ϵ.

Let $\xi^{\bar{\delta}}$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \xi^{\bar{\delta}} = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \bar{\Omega} \\ \xi^{\bar{\delta}} = \frac{c_0}{2} \ \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \xi^{\bar{\delta}} = -2\bar{\delta} & \text{on } \partial B_1. \end{cases}$$

Since $\xi^{\bar{\delta}} \to \xi^0$ in $C^\infty(\bar{B}_1)$, we have, for small $\bar{\delta}$,

$$\xi^{\bar{\delta}}(0) > \frac{1}{2} \xi^0(0) > 0, \tag{41}$$

where ξ^0 is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\xi^0 = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \bar{\Omega} \\ \xi^0 = \frac{c_0}{2} \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \xi^0 = 0 \text{ on } \partial B_1. \end{cases}$$

In the following, we fix some $\bar{\delta} > 0$ such that (41) holds.

Let G be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta G = \delta_0 & \text{in } B_1 \\ G = 0 \text{ on } \partial B_1, \quad G(x) \to \infty \text{ as } x \to 0, \end{cases}$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac mass at 0.

Let $A > 1$ be chosen later. $\forall 0 < \delta < \frac{1}{10}$, consider $\eta_\epsilon := u_\epsilon + \frac{A}{G(\delta)}G - \xi^{\bar{\delta}}$ on $B_1 \setminus \{B_\delta \cup \Omega\}$. We have

$$\Delta\eta_\epsilon \leq 0 \quad \text{in } B_1 \setminus \overline{\{B_\delta \cup \Omega\}}.$$

Near ∂B_δ,

$$\eta_\epsilon \geq -\bar{\delta} + \frac{A}{2} - \frac{1}{2}c_0 > 0, \quad \text{for large } A,$$

and near ∂B_1, $\eta_\epsilon \geq -\bar{\delta} + \frac{3}{2}\bar{\delta} > 0$. Hence

$$\eta_\epsilon > 0 \quad \text{in } B_1 \setminus \overline{\{B_\delta \cup \Omega\}}. \tag{42}$$

For any fixed $x \in B_1 \setminus \{0\}$, $\forall\ 0 < \delta < |x|$, $\forall \epsilon > 0$ small, sending $\delta \to 0$ in (42), it leads to $u_\epsilon(x) \geq \xi^{\bar{\delta}}(x)$. Therefore, $\forall \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$,

$$\liminf_{r\to 0} \inf_{B_r} u = \liminf_{r \to 0} \inf_{B_r} u_\epsilon \geq \xi^{\bar{\delta}}(0) > \frac{1}{2}\xi_0(0) > 0.$$

□

Lemma 4.1 is sufficient for our use. Such result holds for more general linear elliptic operators of second order. For example, we have

Lemma 4.2 *For $n \geq 2$ and $B_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $u \in C^2(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ satisfy*

$$Lu := a^{ij}u_{ij} + b^i u_i + cu \leq f \qquad \text{in } B_1 \setminus \{0\},$$

where $(a^{ij}) > 0$ and $a^{ij} \in C^\alpha(B_1)$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $f, b_i, c \in L^\infty(B_1)$. Assume $\exists$ $a \in R$ and $p \neq q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$u(x) \geq \max\{a + p \cdot x - \delta(x), a + q \cdot x - \delta(x)\} \quad \forall x \in\ B_1 \setminus \{0\},$$

where $\delta > 0$ *satisfies* $\lim_{x\to 0}\frac{\delta(x)}{|x|} = 0$. *Then*

$$\liminf_{x\to 0} u(x) > a.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let

$$v(x) := a + p\cdot x - \delta(x), \quad w(x) := a + q\cdot x - \delta(x), \quad \forall x \in B_1.$$

By subtracting $a + p\cdot x$ from u, v, w respectively, and replacing $f(x)$ by $f(x) - b^i(x)v_i(0) - c(x)\nabla v(0)\cdot x - c(x)v(0)$, we can assume

$$a = 0, \quad p = 0, \quad Lu \le f \quad \text{in } B_1 \setminus \{0\}.$$

Let $Q \in GL(n)$ satisfy $Q(a^{ij}(0))Q^t = I_{n\times n}$. Replacing u, v, w by

$$u(Q^{-1}\cdot), \quad v(Q^{-1}\cdot), \quad w(Q^{-1}\cdot),$$

and $a^{ij}(x), b^i(x), c(x), f(x)$ by

$$Q(a^{ij}(Q^{-1}x))Q^t, \quad Q^t(b^i(Q^{-1}x)), \quad c(Q^{-1}x), \quad \bar{f}(Q^{-1}x)$$

respectively, we can assume $(a^{ij})(0) = I_{n\times n}$.

Let $u_\epsilon := \frac{1}{\epsilon}u(\epsilon\cdot)$, $v_\epsilon := \frac{1}{\epsilon}v(\epsilon\cdot)$, and $w_\epsilon := \frac{1}{\epsilon}w(\epsilon\cdot)$. We have

$$v_\epsilon(x) = o(1), \quad w_\epsilon(x) = \nabla w(0)\cdot x + o(1) \quad \text{on } \bar{B}_1.$$

We may also assume that $|\nabla w(0)| = 1$ by a dilation. Hence, by $u_\epsilon \ge v_\epsilon$ and $u_\epsilon \ge w_\epsilon$, $\forall \bar{\delta} > 0$, $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\forall \epsilon \le \epsilon_0$,

$$u_\epsilon(x) \ge -\bar{\delta} \ \text{ on } B_1, \quad u_\epsilon \ge c_0 \ \text{ on } \Omega := B_{\frac{1}{4}}(\frac{1}{2}\nabla w(0)),$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is some universal constant independent of $\bar{\delta}$ and ϵ. Moreover u_ϵ satisfies the equation

$$L^\epsilon u_\epsilon(x) := a^{ij}(\epsilon x)(u_\epsilon)_{ij}(x) + \epsilon b^i(\epsilon x)(u_\epsilon)_i(x) + \epsilon^2 c(\epsilon x)u_\epsilon(x) \le \epsilon f(\epsilon x) \quad \text{in } B_1.$$

Let $\xi_{\bar{\delta}}$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} L^\epsilon \xi^{\bar{\delta}}(x) = \epsilon f(\epsilon x) & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \bar{\Omega} \\ \xi^{\bar{\delta}} = \frac{c_0}{2} \ \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \xi^{\bar{\delta}} = -2\bar{\delta} \ \text{ on } \partial B_1. \end{cases}$$

We have $\xi^{\bar{\delta}} \to \xi^0$ in $C^1(B_1 \setminus \bar{\Omega})$, where ξ^0 is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\xi^0 = 0 & \text{in } B_1 \setminus \bar{\Omega} \\ \xi^0 = \frac{c_0}{2} \ \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \xi^0 = 0 \ \text{ on } \partial B_1. \end{cases}$$

Hence we can initially pick some $\bar{\delta} > 0$ such that $\xi^{\bar{\delta}}(0) > \xi^0(0) > 0$.

Let G be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -L^{\epsilon} G = \delta_0 & \text{in } B_1 \\ G = 0 \ \text{ on } \partial B_1, \quad G(x) \to \infty \ \text{ as } x \to 0. \end{cases}$$

We know G is asymptotically radial as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Let $A > 1$ be chosen later. $\forall 0 < \delta < \frac{1}{10}$, consider $\eta_\epsilon := u_\epsilon + \frac{A}{\min\limits_{\partial B_\delta} G} G - \xi^{\bar{\delta}}$ on $B_1 \setminus \{B_\delta \cup \Omega\}$. We have

$$L^{\epsilon}\eta_\epsilon \le 0 \quad \text{in } B_1 \setminus \overline{\{B_\delta \cup \Omega\}}.$$

On ∂B_δ,

$$\eta_\epsilon \ge -\bar{\delta} + A - \frac{c_0}{2} > 0,$$

and on ∂B_1, $-\bar{\delta} + 2\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta} > 0$. Hence

$$\eta_\epsilon > 0 \quad \text{in } B_1 \setminus \overline{\{B_\delta \cup \Omega\}}. \tag{43}$$

For any fixed $x \in B_1 \setminus \{0\}$, $\forall\ 0 < \delta < |x|$, $\forall \epsilon \le \epsilon_0$, sending $\delta \to 0$ in (43), then $u_\epsilon(x) \ge \xi^{\bar{\delta}}(x)$. Therefore $\liminf\limits_{x\to 0} u(x) = \liminf\limits_{x \to 0} u_\epsilon(x) \ge \xi^{\bar{\delta}}(0) > \frac{1}{2}\xi^0(0) > 0$.

□

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. Since u is a positive superharmonic function, we have, by the maximum principle, that

$$u(x) \ge \frac{\min\limits_{\partial B_1} u}{|x|^{n-2}}, \quad \forall\ |x| \ge 1.$$

In particular

$$\liminf_{|x|\to\infty} (|x|^{n-2} u(x)) > 0. \tag{44}$$

Lemma 4.3 *For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists $\lambda_0(x) > 0$ such that*

$$u_{x,\lambda}(y) := (\frac{\lambda}{|y-x|})^{n-2} u(x + \frac{\lambda^2(y-x)}{|y-x|^2}) \le u(y), \quad \forall\ |y-x| \ge \lambda,\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_0(x).$$

Proof. This follows from the proof of lemma 2.1 in [54].

□

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, set

$$\bar{\lambda}(x) := \sup\{\mu \mid u_{x,\lambda}(y) \le u(y),\ \forall\ |y-x| \ge \lambda,\ 0 < \lambda < \mu\}.$$

Let

$$\alpha := \liminf_{|x|\to\infty}(|x|^{n-2}u(x)). \tag{45}$$

Because of (44),

$$0 < \alpha \le \infty. \tag{46}$$

If $\alpha = \infty$, then the moving sphere procedure will never stop and therefore $\bar{\lambda}(x) = \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. This follows from arguments in [54] and [44] (see also [46]). By the definition of $\bar{\lambda}(x)$ and the fact $\bar{\lambda}(x) = \infty$, we have,

$$u_{x,\lambda}(y) \le u(y), \quad \forall\ |y-x| \ge \lambda > 0.$$

By a calculus lemma (see e.g., lemma 11.2 in [54]), $u \equiv \mathit{constant}$, and Theorem 1.3 for $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ is proved in this case (i.e. $\alpha = \infty$). So, from now on, we assume

$$0 < \alpha < \infty. \tag{47}$$

By the definition of $\bar{\lambda}(x)$,

$$u_{x,\lambda}(y) \le u(y), \quad \forall\ |y-x| \ge \lambda,\ 0 < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(x).$$

Multiplying the above by $|y|^{n-2}$ and sending $|y| \to \infty$, we have,

$$\alpha \ge \lambda^{n-2}u(x), \qquad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(x).$$

Sending $\lambda \to \bar{\lambda}(x)$, we have (using (47)),

$$\infty > \alpha \ge \bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2}u(x), \quad \forall\ x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{48}$$

Since the moving sphere procedure stops at $\bar{\lambda}(x)$, we must have, by using the arguments in [54] and [44] (see also [46]),

$$\liminf_{|y|\to\infty}(u(y) - u_{x,\bar{\lambda}(x)}(y))|y|^{n-2} = 0, \tag{49}$$

i.e.,

$$\alpha = \bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2}u(x), \quad \forall\ x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{50}$$

Let us switch to some more convenient notations. For a Mobius transformation ϕ, we use notation

$$u_\phi := |J_\phi|^{\frac{n-2}{2n}}(u \circ \phi),$$

where J_ϕ denotes the Jacobian of ϕ.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$\phi^{(x)}(y) := x + \frac{\bar{\lambda}(x)^2(y-x)}{|y-x|^2},$$

we know that $u_{\phi^{(x)}} = u_{x,\bar{\lambda}(x)}$.

Let $\psi(y) := \frac{y}{|y|^2}$, and let

$$w^{(x)} := (u_{\phi^{(x)}})_\psi = u_{\phi^{(x)} \circ \psi}.$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the only possible singularity for $w^{(x)}$ (on $\mathbb{R}^n \cup \{\infty\}$) is $\frac{x}{|x|^2}$. In particular, $y = 0$ is a regular point of $w^{(x)}$. A direct calculation yields

$$w^{(x)}(0) = \bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2} u(x),$$

and therefore, by (50),

$$w^{(x)}(0) = \alpha, \quad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Clearly, $u_\psi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ and $\Delta u_\psi \le 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, $\liminf_{y \to 0} u_\psi(y) = \alpha$, and, for some $\delta(x) > 0$,

$$w^{(x)} \in C^2(B_{\delta(x)}), \quad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

$$u_\psi \ge w^{(x)} \quad \text{in } B_{\delta(x)} \setminus \{0\}, \quad \forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Lemma 4.4 $\nabla w^{(x)}(0) = \nabla w^{(0)}(0)$, *i.e.,* $\nabla w^{(x)}(0)$ *is independent of* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. This follows from Lemma 4.1. Indeed, for any $x,\ \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let

$$v := w^{(x)}, \quad w := w^{(\tilde{x})}, \quad u := u_\psi.$$

We know that $w(0) = v(0)$, $u_\psi \ge w$ and $u_\psi \ge v$ near the origin, and we also know that $\liminf_{y \to 0} u_\psi(y) = w(0)$, so, by Lemma 4.1, we must have $\nabla v(0) = \nabla w(0)$, i.e., $\nabla w^{(x)}(0) = \nabla w^{(\tilde{x})}(0)$. Lemma 4.4 is established.

$\square$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} w^{(x)}(y) &= \frac{1}{|y|^{n-2}}\Big\{(\frac{\bar\lambda(x)}{|\frac{y}{|y|^2}-x|})^{n-2}u(x+\frac{\bar\lambda(x)^2(\frac{y}{|y|^2}-x)}{|\frac{y}{|y|^2}-x|^2})\Big\} \\ &= (\frac{\bar\lambda(x)}{|\frac{y}{|y|}-|y|x|})^{n-2}u(x+\frac{\bar\lambda(x)^2(y-|y|^2x)}{|\frac{y}{|y|}-|y|x|^2}) \\ &= (\frac{\bar\lambda(x)^2}{1-2x\cdot y+|y|^2|x|^2})^{\frac{n-2}{2}}u(x+\frac{\bar\lambda(x)^2(y-|y|^2x)}{1-2x\cdot y+|y|^2|x|^2}). \end{aligned}$$

So, for $|y|$ small,

$$w^{(x)}(y) = \bar\lambda(x)^{n-2}(1+(n-2)x\cdot y)u(x+\bar\lambda(x)^2y)+O(|y|^2),$$

and, using (50),

$$\nabla w^{(x)}(0) = (n-2)\bar\lambda(x)^{n-2}u(x)x+\bar\lambda(x)^n\nabla u(x) = (n-2)\alpha x+\alpha^{\frac{n}{n-2}}u(x)^{\frac{n}{2-n}}\nabla u(x).$$

By Lemma 4.4, $\vec{V} := \nabla w^{(x)}(0)$ is a constant vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$, so we have,

$$\nabla_x(\frac{n-2}{2}\alpha^{\frac{n}{n-2}}u(x)^{-\frac{2}{n-2}}-\frac{(n-2)\alpha}{2}|x|^2+\vec{V}\cdot x) \equiv 0.$$

Consequently, for some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $d \in R$,

$$u(x)^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} \equiv \alpha^{-\frac{2}{n-2}}|x-\bar{x}|^2+d\alpha^{-\frac{2}{n-2}}.$$

Since $u > 0$, we must have $d > 0$. Thus

$$u(x) \equiv (\frac{\alpha^{\frac{2}{n-2}}}{d+|x-\bar{x}|^2})^{\frac{n-2}{2}}.$$

Let $a = \alpha^{\frac{2}{n-2}}d^{-1}$ and $b = d^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then u is of the form (24). Clearly $A^u(0) = 2b^2a^{-2}I$, so $2b^2a^{-2}I \in U$ and $F(2b^2a^{-2}I) = 1$. Theorem 1.3 in the case $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ is established.

$\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.3 for $-\infty < p < \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. In this case, the equation satisfied by u is no longer conformally invariant, but it transforms to our advantage when making reflections with respect to spheres, i.e., the inequalities have the right direction so that the strong maximum principle and the Hopf lemma can still be applied.

First, we still have (44) since this only requires the superharmonicity and the positivity of u. Lemma 4.3 still holds since it only uses (44) and the C^1 regularity of u in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we still define $\bar{\lambda}(x)$ in the same way. We also define α as in (45) and we still have (46).

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda > 0$, the equation of $u_{x,\lambda}$ now takes the form

$$F(A^{u_{x,\lambda}}(y)) = (\frac{\lambda}{|y-x|})^{(n-2)(\frac{n+2}{n-2}-p)} u_{x,\lambda}(y)^{p-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad A^{u_{x,\lambda}}(y) \in U, \quad \forall\, y \neq x. \tag{51}$$

Lemma 4.5 *If $\alpha = \infty$, then $\bar{\lambda}(x) = \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary, $\bar{\lambda}(\bar{x}) < \infty$ for some $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\bar{x} = 0$, and we use notations

$$\bar{\lambda} := \bar{\lambda}(0), \quad u_\lambda := u_{0,\lambda}, \quad B_\lambda := B_\lambda(0).$$

By the definition of $\bar{\lambda}$,

$$u_{\bar{\lambda}} \le u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\bar{\lambda}}.$$

By (51),

$$F(A^{u_{\bar{\lambda}}}) \le u_{\bar{\lambda}}^{p-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad A^{u_{\bar{\lambda}}} \in U, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\bar{\lambda}}. \tag{52}$$

Recall that u satisfies

$$F(A^u) = u^{p-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}, \quad A^u \in U, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\bar{\lambda}}. \tag{53}$$

By (52) and (53),

$$F(A^{u_{\bar{\lambda}}}) - F(A^u) - (u_{\bar{\lambda}}^{p-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} - u^{p-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}) \le 0, \quad A^{u_{\bar{\lambda}}} \in U,\ A^u \in U, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\bar{\lambda}}. \tag{54}$$

Since $\alpha = \infty$, we have

$$\liminf_{|y|\to\infty} |y|^{n-2}(u - u_{\bar{\lambda}})(y) > 0. \tag{55}$$

The inequality in (54) goes the right direction. Thus, with (55), the arguments for $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ work essentially in the same way here and we obtain a contradiction by continuing the moving sphere procedure a little bit further. This deserves some explanations. Because of (55), and using arguments in [44] (see also [46]), we only need to show that

$$u_{\bar{\lambda}}(y) < u(y), \quad \forall\ |y| > \bar{\lambda}, \tag{56}$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dr}(u - u_{\bar{\lambda}})|_{\partial B_{\bar{\lambda}}} > 0, \tag{57}$$

where $\frac{d}{dr}$ denotes the differentiation in the outer normal direction with respect to $\partial B_{\bar{\lambda}}$.

If $u_{\bar{\lambda}}(\bar{y}) = u(\bar{y})$ for some $|\bar{y}| > \bar{\lambda}$, then, using (54) as in the proof of lemma 2.1 in [44], we know that $u_{\bar{\lambda}} - u$ satisfies that

$$L(u_{\bar{\lambda}} - u) \leq 0,$$

where $L = -a_{ij}(x)\partial_{ij} + b_i(x)\partial_i + c(x)$ with $(a_{ij}) > 0$ continuous and b_i, c continuous.

Since $u_{\bar{\lambda}} - u \leq 0$ near $\bar{y}$, we have, by the strong maximum principle, $u_{\bar{\lambda}} \equiv u$ near $\bar{y}$. For the same reason, $u_{\bar{\lambda}}(y) \equiv u(y)$ for any $|y| \geq \bar{\lambda}$, violating (55). (56) has been checked. Estimate (57) can be established in a similar way by using the Hopf lemma (see the proof of lemma 2.1 in [44]). Thus Lemma 4.5 is established.

□

By Lemma 4.5 and the usual arguments, we know that if $\alpha = \infty$, u must be a constant, and Theorem 1.3 for $-\infty < p < \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ is also proved in this case.

From now on, we always assume (47). As before, we obtain (48). Since the inequality in (52) goes the right direction, the arguments for $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ (see also the arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.5) essentially apply and we still have (49) and (50). Applying the rest of the arguments for $p = \frac{n+2}{n-2}$, we have u is of the form (24) with some positive constants a and b. However, we know that, for u of the form (24), $A^u \equiv 2b^2a^{-2}I$ and $F(A^u) \equiv constant$. This violates (23) since $u^{p-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}$ is not a constant when $p < \frac{n+2}{n-2}$. Theorem 1.3 for $-\infty < p < \frac{n+2}{n-2}$ is established.

□

5 Proof of Theorem 1.4-1.6

5.1 Proof of Theorem 1.4.

To prove Theorem 1.4, let us first establish Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let u be the same as in Theorem 1.6, we let

$$v(r) = u(r, 0 \cdots, 0), \quad 0 \leq r < 1.$$

Clearly, $v'(0) = 0$. For $x = (r, 0 \cdots, 0)$, $0 < r < 1$, we have

$$\nabla u(x) = (v'(r), 0 \cdots, 0), \quad \nabla^2 u(x) = diag(v''(r), \frac{v'(r)}{r}, \cdots, \frac{v'(r)}{r}),$$

and

$$A^u(x) = diag(\lambda_1^v(r), \lambda_2^v(r), \cdots, \lambda_n^v(r)),$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1^v(r) = -\frac{2}{n-2} v^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} v'' + \frac{2(n-1)}{(n-2)^2} v^{-\frac{2n}{n-2}} (v')^2 \\ \lambda_2^v(r) = \cdots = \lambda_n^v(r) = -\frac{2}{n-2} v^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} \frac{v'}{r} - \frac{2}{(n-2)^2} v^{-\frac{2n}{n-2}} (v')^2. \end{cases}$$

Here and in the following, we use $diag(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ to denote the diagonal matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & & \\ & \lambda_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \lambda_n \end{pmatrix}$$

Let $w(x) = (\frac{a}{1+b|x|^2})^{\frac{n-2}{2}}$ with $a = v(0)^{\frac{2}{n-2}}$ and $b = \frac{1}{2-n} a^{\frac{2-n}{2}} v''(0)$. With these choices of a and b, we have

$$w(0) = v(0), \quad w'(0) = v'(0) = 0, \quad w''(0) = v''(0).$$

A calculation yields

$$A^w(x) \equiv \frac{2b}{a^2} I = A^u(0),$$

and therefore w satisfies

$$F(A^w) = 1, \quad A^w \in U, \quad w > 0, \quad \text{in } \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid b|x|^2 > -1\}.$$

Introduce $f(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) = F(diag(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n))$. Clearly,

$$\lambda_j(0) := \lim_{r \to 0} \lambda_j(r) = -\frac{2}{n-2} v(0)^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} v''(0), \quad 1 \le j \le n,$$

and therefore, by the symmetry of f in $\lambda_1 \cdots, \lambda_n$, we have

$$f_{\lambda_j}(\lambda_1(0), \cdots, \lambda_n(0)) = f_{\lambda_1}(\lambda_1(0), \cdots, \lambda_n(0)), \quad 2 \le j \le n.$$

Since $diag(\lambda_1(0), \cdots, \lambda_n(0)) \in U$, we have, by (17), $f_{\lambda_1}(\lambda_1(0), \cdots, \lambda_n(0)) > 0$.

Lemma 5.1 *Let α and β be positive constants, and let $k \ge 1$ be an integer satisfying $k + \gamma > \alpha$ for some $0 < \gamma \le 1$. Assume that $\xi \in C^{k-1,\gamma}([0, \beta])$ satisfies*

$$|\xi(r)| \le \frac{\alpha}{r} \int_0^r |\xi(s)| \, ds, \quad \forall \ 0 < r < \beta, \tag{58}$$

and

$$\xi(0) = \xi'(0) = \cdots = \xi^{(k-1)}(0) = 0. \tag{59}$$

Then

$$\xi \equiv 0 \quad \textit{on } [0, \beta]. \tag{60}$$

Proof. We deduce, from (59), that

$$|\xi(r)| \le C r^{k-1+\gamma}, \quad 0 \le r \le \beta, \tag{61}$$

where C is some positive constant.

Using (61), we deduce, from (58), that

$$|\xi(r)| \le \frac{\alpha}{r} \int_0^r C s^{k-1+\gamma}\, ds = \frac{C\alpha}{k+\gamma} r^{k-1+\gamma}, \quad 0 \le r \le \beta. \tag{62}$$

Using (62), we deduce, from (58), that

$$|\xi(r)| \le \frac{\alpha}{r} \int_0^r \frac{C\alpha}{k+\gamma} s^{k-1+\gamma}\, ds = C(\frac{\alpha}{k+\gamma})^2 r^{k-1+\gamma}, \quad 0 \le r \le \beta.$$

Continue this way(by induction), we have

$$|\xi(r)| \le C(\frac{\alpha}{k+\gamma})^j r^{k-1+\gamma}, \quad \forall\ 0 \le r \le \beta, \ \ \forall\ j = 1, 2, \cdots.$$

Since $\frac{\alpha}{k+\gamma} < 1$, we obtain (60) by sending $j \to \infty$. Lemma 5.1 is established.

□

Continue the proof of Theorem 1.6. Since

$$1 = f(\lambda_1^v(r), \cdots, \lambda_n^v(r)) = f(\lambda_1^w(r), \cdots, \lambda_n^w(r)),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^1 \Big(\frac{d}{dt} f(t\lambda^v(r) + (1-t)\lambda^w(r))\Big)\, dt \\ &= \Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 f_{\lambda_i}(t\lambda^v(r) + (1-t)\lambda^w(r))\, dt\Big)(\lambda_i^v(r) - \lambda_i^w(r)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda^v(0) = \lambda^w(0)$ and $f_{\lambda_i}(\lambda^v(0)) = f_{\lambda_1}(\lambda^v(0)) > 0$, we deduce from the above that

$$\lambda_1^v(r) - \lambda_1^w(r) = -\sum_{i=2}^n (1 + o(1))(\lambda_i^v(r) - \lambda_i^w(r)),$$

where $o(1)$ denotes some quantities tending to 0 as $r \to 0$.

Since $v'(0) = w'(0) = 0$, we have

$$\lambda_1^v(r) - \lambda_1^w(r) = -\frac{2}{n-2} v(r)^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} (v''(r) - w''(r)) + O(1)(|v(r) - w(r)| + |v'(r) - w'(r)|),$$

and, for $2 \le i \le n$,

$$\lambda_i^v(r) - \lambda_i^w(r) = -\frac{2}{n-2} v(r)^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}} \frac{v'(r) - w'(r)}{r} + O(1)(|v(r) - w(r)| + |v'(r) - w'(r)|).$$

It follows that

$$v''(r) - w''(r) = -\frac{n-1}{r}(v'(r) - w'(r))(1 + o(1)) + O(1)(|v(r) - w(r)| + |v'(r) - w'(r)|),$$

i.e.,

$$(r^{n-1}(v'(r) - w'(r)))' = o(r^{n-2})|v'(r) - w'(r)| + O(r^{n-1})(|v(r) - w(r)| + |v'(r) - w'(r)|).$$

Integrating the above, we have, using $v(0) - w(0) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |v'(r) - w'(r)| \\ \le \ & \frac{o(1)}{r} \int_0^r |v'(s) - w'(s)| \, ds + C \int_0^r (|v(s) - w(s)| + |v'(s) - w'(s)|) \, ds \\ \le \ & \frac{o(1)}{r} \int_0^r |v'(s) - w'(s)| \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 5.1 to $\xi = v' - w'$, we have, for some $\delta > 0$,

$$v'(r) - w'(r) \equiv 0 \qquad \text{in } (0, \delta).$$

For $r \ge \delta$, the O.D.E. satisfied by u and w is regular, so $v \equiv w$ in $(0,1)$. Hence w is regular in $(0,1)$. Consequently, $b \ge -1$.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. To give the main idea of the proof, we first prove Theorem 1.4 under a stronger assumption on u, i.e.,

$$u_{0,1}(x) := |x|^{2-n} u(\frac{x}{|x|^2}) \ \text{ can be extended to a positive function in } \ C^2(\overline{B_1^+}), \quad (63)$$

and

$$A^{u_{0,1}} \in U \quad \text{on } \overline{B_1^+}. \tag{64}$$

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda > 0$, let $u_{x,\lambda}$ denote the reflection of u with respect to $B_\lambda(x)$, i.e.,

$$u_{x,\lambda}(y) := (\frac{\lambda}{|y-x|})^{n-2} u(x + \frac{\lambda^2 (y-x)}{|y-x|^2}).$$

Lemma 5.2 *Let u be as in Theorem 1.4. Then, for any $x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$, there exists $\lambda_0(x) > 0$ such that*

$$u_{x,\lambda} \leq u \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus B_\lambda(x), \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_0(x). \tag{65}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We follow the arguments in the proof of lemma 2.1 in [54]. Without loss of generality, take $x = 0$ in (65), and we use u_λ to denote $u_{0,\lambda}$. By the C^1 regularity of u, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dr}(r^{\frac{n-2}{2}} u(r,\theta)) > 0, \quad \forall\ 0 < r < r_0,\ \theta \in S^{n-1},$$

from which, we deduce

$$u_\lambda(y) < u(y), \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < |y| < r_0. \tag{66}$$

Because of (26), there exists some constant $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$u(y) \geq \frac{\alpha}{|y|^{n-2}}, \quad \forall\ |y| \geq r_0.$$

Let $\lambda_0 = \min\{\alpha^{\frac{1}{n-2}}(\max_{\overline{B^+_{r_0}}} u)^{\frac{1}{2-n}}, r_0\}$. Then

$$u_\lambda(y) \leq (\frac{\lambda_0}{|y|})^{n-2}(\max_{\overline{B^+_{r_0}}} u) \leq \frac{\alpha}{|y|^{n-2}} \leq u(y), \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_0,\ |y| \geq r_0.$$

(65) with $x = 0$ follows from (66) and the above. Lemma 5.2 is established.

□

For $x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$, let

$$\bar\lambda(x) := \sup\{\mu > 0 | u_{x,\lambda} \leq u \ \text{ on } \ \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus B_\lambda(x), \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \mu\}. \tag{67}$$

Clearly, $\bar\lambda(x) > 0$. On the other hand, $\bar\lambda(x) < \infty$ because of (26).

Lemma 5.3 *Let u be as in Theorem 1.4, and we further assume that u satisfies (63) and (64). Then, for all $x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$,*

$$u_{x,\bar\lambda(x)} \equiv u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \{x\}. \tag{68}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.3. Without loss of generality, take $x = 0$. We use notation $\bar\lambda = \bar\lambda(0)$ and $u_\lambda = u_{0,\lambda}$. By the definition of $\bar\lambda$,

$$u_{\bar\lambda} \le u \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus B_{\bar\lambda}. \tag{69}$$

From now on, we always assume that (68) does not hold for $x = 0$, and we will reach a contradiction. We first show that

$$u - u_{\bar\lambda} > 0 \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus \overline{B^+_{\bar\lambda}}. \tag{70}$$

Indeed, if, for some $\bar x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \overline{B^+_{\bar\lambda}}$, $(u - u_{\bar\lambda})(\bar x) = 0$. Using (25) and hypotheses (14) and (15), we have

$$F(A^{u_{\bar\lambda}}) = 1 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \overline{B_{\bar\lambda}}.$$

A calculation yields, using (25),

$$\frac{\partial u_{\bar\lambda}}{\partial x_n} = c u_{\bar\lambda}^{\frac{n}{n-2}}, \quad \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_{\bar\lambda}.$$

Arguing as in the proof of lemma 2.1 in [44] (using hypotheses (16) and (17)), we have, near $\bar x$,

$$0 = F(A^u) - F(A^{u_{\bar\lambda}}) = L(u - u_{\bar\lambda}), \tag{71}$$

where $L = -a_{ij}(x)\partial_{ij} + b_i(x)\partial_i + c(x)$ is an elliptic operator with continuous coefficients. By the strong maximum principle, $u - u_{\bar\lambda} \equiv 0$ near $\bar x$. This implies (68) for $x = 0$, a contradiction.

If $(u - u_{\bar\lambda})(\bar x) = 0$ for some $\bar x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \overline{B^+_{\bar\lambda}}$, we have

$$\frac{\partial(u - u_{\bar\lambda})}{\partial x_n}(\bar x) = (c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - c u_{\bar\lambda}^{\frac{n}{n-2}})(\bar x) = 0.$$

Since we still have (71) near $\bar x$, we apply the Hopf Lemma to obtain that $u - u_{\bar\lambda} \equiv 0$ near $\bar x$, again leading to (68) for $x = 0$, a contradiction. We have established (70).

Next we show that

$$\lim_{y \in \bar R^n_+, |y| \to \infty} |y|^{n-2}(u(y) - u_{\bar\lambda}(y)) > 0. \tag{72}$$

Let $x = \frac{y}{|y|^2}$, we have

$$|y|^{n-2} u(y) = u_{0,1}(x), \quad |y|^{n-2} u_{\bar\lambda}(y) = \bar\lambda^{n-2} u(\frac{\bar\lambda^2 y}{|y|^2}) = \bar\lambda^{n-2} u(\bar\lambda^2 x) =: v(x).$$

By (63), (64) and the conformal invariance of the equation (25), both $u_{0,1}$ and v are C^2 solutions of (25). We also know, from (70), that

$$u_{0,1} - v > 0 \quad \text{in } B^+_{\frac{1}{\bar\lambda}}.$$

By the same arguments used in proving $u - u_{\bar\lambda} > 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \overline{B^+_{\bar\lambda}}$, we have

$$(u_{0,1} - v)(0) > 0,$$

which implies (72).

Since $u - u_{\bar\lambda} = 0$ on $\partial B_{\bar\lambda} \cap \mathbb{R}^n_+$ and (70), we can apply the Hopf Lemma as in the proof of lemma 2.1 in [44] (see also the outlines near (71)) to obtain

$$\frac{\partial(u - u_{\bar\lambda})}{\partial\nu} > 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_{\bar\lambda} \cap \mathbb{R}^n_+, \tag{73}$$

where ν denotes the unit outer normal of $\partial B_{\bar\lambda}$.

At last we prove that

$$\frac{\partial(u - u_{\bar\lambda})}{\partial\nu} > 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_{\bar\lambda} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+, \tag{74}$$

where ν still denotes the unit outer normal of $\partial B_{\bar\lambda}$.

Let $\bar{x} \in \partial B_{\bar\lambda} \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$. Then as in the proof of lemma 2.1 in [44], we have (71) near $\bar{x}$ with continuous coefficients. Clearly, for some constant $A > 0$,

$$\left|\frac{\partial(u - u_{\bar\lambda})}{\partial x_n}\right| = |c(u^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - u_{\bar\lambda}^{\frac{n}{n-2}})| \le A(u - u_{\bar\lambda}), \quad \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \overline{B^+_{\bar\lambda}}) \cap B_1(\bar{x}).$$

By (71), and for a possibly larger A, we have

$$a_{ij}\partial_{ij}(u - u_{\bar\lambda}) + b_i\partial_i(u - u_{\bar\lambda}) \le A(u - u_{\bar\lambda}), \quad \text{in } (\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \overline{B^+_{\bar\lambda}}) \cap B_1(\bar{x}).$$

Now an application of lemma 10.1 in [54] (with $\Omega = (\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \overline{B_{\bar\lambda}}) \cap B_1(\bar{x})$, $\sigma = x_n$, $\rho = |x|^2 - \bar\lambda^2$, and our $u - u_{\bar\lambda}$ being the u there) yields

$$\frac{\partial(u - u_{\bar\lambda})}{\partial\nu}(\bar{x}) > 0.$$

So we have established (74).

Given (70), (72), (73), (74), the positivity and continuity of u on $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}$, we can easily prove that there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$u_\lambda \le u \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus B^+_\lambda, \quad \forall\ \bar\lambda \le \lambda \le \bar\lambda + \epsilon,$$

which violates the definition of $\bar{\lambda}$. Lemma 5.3 is established.

$\square$

The Proof of Theorem 1.4 under the additional hypotheses (63) and (64). Let u be as in Theorem 1.4 and u satisfies (63) and (64). By Lemma 5.3 and a calculus lemma used in [57] (see, e.g., lemma 11.1 in [54]),

$$u(x',0) \equiv \frac{\hat{a}}{(|x'-\bar{x}'|^2+d^2)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}}, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, \tag{75}$$

where $\bar{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $\hat{a}$ and d are positive constants.

Let $P = (\bar{x}', -d)$ and define

$$v(z) := (\frac{2d}{|z-P|})^{n-2} u(P + \frac{4d^2(z-P)}{|z-P|^2}).$$

By the arguments in [57] and [4], as in the proof of lemma 4.5 in [54], we know that v is radially symmetric with respect to $Q := (\bar{x}', d)$ in $B_{2d}(Q)$. By the conformal invariance of the equation satisfied by u, we have

$$F(A^v) = 1, \quad A^v \in U, \quad v > 0, \quad \text{in } \overline{B_{2d}(Q)}.$$

By Theorem 1.6,

$$v(z) \equiv (\frac{\bar{a}}{1+\bar{b}|z-Q|^2}^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \quad \text{in } \overline{B_{2d}(Q)},$$

where $\bar{a} > 0$ and $1 + \bar{b}(2d)^2 > 0$. Compare this to (75), we must have $\bar{b} > 0$. This, together with (75), implies

$$u(x) \equiv (\frac{a}{1+b|x-\bar{x}|^2})^{\frac{n-2}{2}} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+,$$

where $a = d^{-2}\hat{a}^{\frac{2}{n-2}}$, $b = d^{-2}$, $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}', \bar{x}_n)$, $\hat{a},\ d,\ \bar{x}'$ are given in (75), and $\bar{x}_n$ is some real number.

Since $A^u(0) = 2a^{-2}bI$, we have $2a^{-2}bI \in U$ and $F(2a^{-2}bI) = F(A^u(0)) = 1$. By the boundary condition of u at $x = 0$, we have $(n-2)a^{-1}b\bar{x}_n = c$. Theorem 1.4 is established under the additional hypotheses.

$\square$

The proof of Theorem 1.4. By Lemma 5.2, there exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that

$$u_\lambda \le u \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus B_\lambda, \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_0, \tag{76}$$

where $u_\lambda = u_{0,\lambda}$ and $B_\lambda = B_\lambda(0)$.

Let $w = u_{0,1}$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.2 and in the proof of lemma 2.1 of [44], there exists some $\lambda_1 > 0$ such that

$$w_\lambda \le w \quad \text{on } \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus B_\lambda, \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_1. \tag{77}$$

Rewriting (76) and (77) as

$$w_\lambda \le w \quad \text{in } B_\lambda^+, \quad \forall\ \lambda > \frac{1}{\lambda_0},$$

and

$$w_\lambda \ge w \quad \text{in } B_\lambda^+, \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_1.$$

Let

$$\underline{\lambda} := \sup\{\mu |\ w_\lambda(x) \ge w(x), \quad \forall\ 0 < |x| \le \lambda \le \mu\},$$

and

$$\overline{\lambda} := \inf\{\mu |\ w_\lambda(x) \le w(x), \quad \forall\ \lambda \ge \mu,\ 0 < |x| \le \lambda\}.$$

If $\overline{\lambda} \le \underline{\lambda}$, then $w_{\underline{\lambda}} \equiv w_{\overline{\lambda}} \equiv w$, and u satisfies (63) and (64). Theorem 1.4 in this case has already been established. In the following, we assume that $\overline{\lambda} > \underline{\lambda}$ and we will reach a contradiction.

Clearly, $w_\lambda(0) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{n-2}} u(0)$, so we have

$$\frac{1}{\overline{\lambda}^{n-2}} u(0) \le w(0) \le \frac{1}{\underline{\lambda}^{n-2}} u(0).$$

Since $\overline{\lambda} > \underline{\lambda}$, there must be at least one strict inequality in the above. Without loss of generality, we assume that

$$w_{\overline{\lambda}}(0) = \frac{1}{\overline{\lambda}^{n-2}} u(0) < w(0).$$

This guarantees that there is no touching of w_λ and w near 0 for λ close to $\overline{\lambda}$. Therefore, by the moving sphere arguments used earlier, we have, for λ close to $\overline{\lambda}$, that

$$w_\lambda \le w \quad \text{in } B_\lambda.$$

This violates the definition of $\overline{\lambda}$. Theorem 1.4 is established.

$\square$

5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let

$$\alpha := \liminf_{x \to \mathbb{R}^n_+, |x| \to \infty} (|x|^{n-2} u(x)) \in [0, \infty].$$

Lemma 5.4

$$\alpha > 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 5.4. We follow the arguments of the proof of lemma 4.1 in [54]. Let

$$O := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ | u(y) < |y|^{2-n}\}.$$

To prove the lemma, we only need to show

$$\liminf_{x \in O, |x| \to \infty} |x|^{n-2} u(x) > 0.$$

We know

$$\Delta u \leq 0 \quad \text{in } O,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n} = c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}} \leq (|c| + 1)|y|^{-2} u \quad \text{on } \partial O \cap \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

For $A > 1$, let

$$\xi(y) := |y - Ae_n|^{2-n} + |y|^{1-n}.$$

For large A and $R = A^2$, we have

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \xi & \leq & 0, \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_R \\ \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x_n}(y) & \geq & \frac{|c|+1}{|y|^2} \xi(y), \quad y \in \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_R. \end{cases}$$

Take $\bar{\epsilon}(A) > 0$ be a small constant such that

$$w := u - \bar{\epsilon}\xi \geq 0 \quad \text{on } \partial(O \setminus B_R) \cap \mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

If follows that

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w & \leq & 0, \quad \text{on } O \setminus B_R \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial x_n}(y) - \frac{|c|+1}{|y|^2} w(y) & \leq & 0, \quad \forall\ y \in \partial(O \setminus B_R) \cap \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\liminf_{x\in O\setminus B_R, |x|\to\infty} w(x) \geq 0$. By the maximum principle,

$$w \geq 0 \quad \text{on } O \setminus B_R.$$

Hence

$$\liminf_{x\in O, |x|\to\infty} |x|^{n-2}u(x) \geq \bar{\epsilon} > 0.$$

Lemma 5.4 is proved.

□

Lemma 5.5 *For any $x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$, there exists $\lambda_0(x) > 0$ such that*

$$u_{x,\lambda} \leq u \quad \textit{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_\lambda(x), \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \lambda_0(x).$$

Proof of Lemma 5.5. Since we know $\alpha > 0$. Lemma 5.5 follows from the proof of Lemma 5.2.

□

For $x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$, let $\bar{\lambda}(x)$ be defined as in (67). By Lemma 5.5, $\bar{\lambda}(x) > 0$.

Lemma 5.6 *If $\alpha = \infty$, then*

$$\bar{\lambda}(x) = \infty, \quad \forall\ x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

If $\alpha < \infty$, then

$$\bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2}u(x) = \alpha, \quad \forall\ x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \tag{78}$$

Proof of Lemma 5.6. By the definition of $\bar{\lambda}(x)$, we know

$$u_{x,\lambda}(y) \leq u(y), \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(x), \quad \forall\ y \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_\lambda(x).$$

It follows that

$$\lambda^{n-2}u(x) = \liminf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n_+, |y|\to\infty} |y|^{n-2}u_{x,\lambda}(y) \leq \liminf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n_+, |y|\to\infty} |y|^{n-2}u(y) = \alpha, \quad \forall\ 0 < \lambda < \bar{\lambda}(x),$$

If $\alpha < \infty$, we have

$$\bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2}u(x) \leq \alpha < \infty, \quad \forall\ x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

In fact we must have

$$\bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2}u(x) = \alpha.$$

Indeed, if $\bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2}u(x) < \alpha$, then

$$\lim_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n_+, |y|\to\infty} |y|^{n-2}(u(y) - u_{x,\bar{\lambda}(x)}(y)) = \alpha - \bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2}u(x) > 0,$$

and the arguments in the proof of Lemma 5.3 show that the moving sphere procedure should not stop at $\bar{\lambda}(x)$, violating the definition of $\bar{\lambda}(x)$.

Now assume $\alpha = \infty$. Without loss of generality, we show $\bar{\lambda} := \bar{\lambda}(0) = \infty$. We prove it by contradiction. Suppose $\bar{\lambda} < \infty$. By the definition of $\bar{\lambda}$, (69) holds. Since $\alpha = \infty$, we have

$$\liminf_{y\in\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}, |y|\to\infty} (u(y) - u_{\bar{\lambda}}(y))|y|^{n-2} = \infty.$$

This plays the same role as (72) in the proof of Lemma 5.3, and the arguments there lead to a contradiction to the definition of $\bar{\lambda}$. Lemma 5.6 is established.

□

To prove Theorem 1.5, we first consider the case $\alpha < \infty$. Our proof goes along the line of the proof of Theorem 1.3. Our next lemma, whose proof is given towards the end of this section, is an analogue of Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 5.7 *For $n \geq 3$, $a, d > 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $p \neq q$, let $u \in C^1(\overline{B^+_d}\setminus\{0\})$ satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u \leq 0, & \text{in } B^+_d \text{ in the distribution sense,} \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n} = cu^{\frac{n}{n-2}}, & \text{on } (\partial B^+_d \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+)\setminus\{0\}, \\ u(x) \geq \max\{a + p\cdot x' + ca^{\frac{n}{n-2}}x_n - \bar{\delta}(|x|), & \\ \qquad\qquad a + q\cdot x' + ca^{\frac{n}{n-2}}x_n - \bar{\delta}(|x|)\}, & \forall\ x \in B^+_d, \end{cases} \tag{79}$$

where $x' = (x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1})$, $\bar{\delta}(r) > 0$ and $\lim_{r\to 0^+}\frac{\bar{\delta}(r)}{r} = 0$. Then

$$\liminf_{x\in B^+_1, x\to 0} u(x) > a.$$

Lemma 5.8 *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.5, if $\alpha < \infty$, then u is of the form (27) with $\bar{x}$, a and b given below (27).*

Proof of Lemma 5.8. For $x \in \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+$, let

$$\phi^{(x)}(y) := x + \frac{\bar{\lambda}(x)^2 (y-x)}{|y-x|^2}, \quad \psi(y) = \frac{y}{|y|^2}, \quad w^{(x)}(y) := (u_{\phi^{(x)}})_\psi = u_{\phi^{(x)} \circ \psi}.$$

By the definition of $\bar{\lambda}(x)$,

$$u \geq u_{\phi^{(x)}} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_{\bar{\lambda}(x)}(x), \quad \forall\, x \in \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+. \tag{80}$$

By (78),

$$w^{(x)}(0) := \bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2} u(x) = \alpha, \quad \forall\, x \in \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

We have

$$\begin{cases} u_\psi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n_+), \\ \Delta u_\psi \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \ \text{ since } \ \Delta u \leq 0 \ \text{ in } \ \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ \liminf\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n_+ \ni y \to 0} u_\psi(y) = \liminf\limits_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n_+, |z| \to \infty} |z|^{n-2} u(z) = \alpha, \end{cases}$$

and it is clear, for some $\delta(x) > 0$ and by (80), that

$$\begin{aligned} w^{(x)} &\in C^2(\overline{B^+_{\delta(x)}}), & \forall\, x \in \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+, \\ u_\psi &\geq w^{(x)}, & \text{in } B^+_{\delta(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

By (25) and the conformal invariance of the boundary condition satisfied by u,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial w^{(x)}}{\partial y_n} &= c[w^{(x)}]^{\frac{n}{n-2}}, \quad \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \{\frac{x}{|x|^2}\} \\ \frac{\partial u_\psi}{\partial y_n} &= c[u_\psi]^{\frac{n}{n-2}}, \quad \text{on } \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 5.7,

$$\nabla_{y'} w^{(x)}(0) = \nabla_{y'} w^{(0)}(0), \quad \forall\, x \in \partial \mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

So for $x = (x', 0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{V} : &= \nabla_{y'} w^{(0)}(0) = (n-2)\bar{\lambda}(x)^{n-2} u(x) x + \bar{\lambda}(x)^n \nabla_{x'} u(x) + \bar{\lambda}(x)^n \nabla_{x'} u(x) \\ &= (n-2)\alpha x' + \alpha^{\frac{n}{n-2}} u(x)^{\frac{n}{2-n}} \nabla_{x'} u(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\nabla_{x'} [\frac{n-2}{2} \alpha^{\frac{n}{n-2}} u(x', 0)^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} - \frac{n-2}{2} |x'|^2 + \vec{V} \cdot x'] = 0,$$

which implies, for some $\bar{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, and $d \in R$, that

$$u(x', 0)^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} \equiv \alpha^{-\frac{2}{n-2}} |x' - \bar{x}'|^2 + d\alpha^{-\frac{2}{n-2}}.$$

Since $u > 0$, we have $d > 0$ and

$$u(x', 0) \equiv \Big(\frac{\alpha^{\frac{2}{n-2}}}{d + |x' - \bar{x}'|^2}\Big)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}. \tag{81}$$

For simplicity, we take $\bar{x}' = 0$. By (78) and the above,

$$\alpha = \bar{\lambda}(0)^{n-2} u(0) = \bar{\lambda}(0)^{n-2} \frac{\alpha}{d^{\frac{n-2}{2}}},$$

which gives $\bar{\lambda} := \bar{\lambda}(0) = \sqrt{d}$.
Since

$$u_{\bar{\lambda}}(y) = (\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{|y|})^{n-2} u(\frac{\bar{\lambda}^2 y}{|y|^2}),$$

we have, by (81),

$$u_{\bar{\lambda}}(x', 0) = \frac{\bar{\lambda}^{n-2}\alpha}{(d|x'|^2 + \bar{\lambda}^4)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} = \frac{\alpha}{(|x'|^2 + d)^{\frac{n-2}{2}}} = u(x', 0), \quad \forall\ x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}.$$

Thus by the conformal invariance of the equation and the boundary condition satisfied by u, we have

$$\begin{cases} F(A^u) = F(A^{u_{\bar{\lambda}}}) = 1, \quad A^u \in U, \quad A^{u_{\bar{\lambda}}} \in U, & \text{in } \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+} \setminus \{0\}, \\ u - u_{\bar{\lambda}} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \{0\}, \\ \frac{\partial(u - u_{\bar{\lambda}})}{\partial x_n} = c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}} - c u_{\bar{\lambda}}^{\frac{n}{n-2}} = 0, & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus \{0\}, \\ u - u_{\bar{\lambda}} \geq 0, & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_{\bar{\lambda}}. \end{cases}$$

As usual, $u - u_{\bar{\lambda}}$ satisfies a linear second order elliptic equation and therefore, by the Hopf lemma and the strong maximum principle,

$$u - u_{\bar{\lambda}} \equiv 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

In particular, u satisfies (63) and (64). So u is of the form (27) by our earlier discussion of Theorem 1.5 under (63) and (64). Lemma 5.8 is established.

□

Lemma 5.9 *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.5 except (29), if $\alpha = \infty$, then*

$$u(x', x_n) \equiv u(0', x_n), \quad \forall\ x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1},\ \forall\ x_n \geq 0. \tag{82}$$

Moreover $c \geq 0$, and if $c = 0$, u must be a constant.

Proof of Lemma 5.9. Since $\alpha = \infty$, we have, by Lemma 5.6,

$$\bar{\lambda}(x) = \infty, \quad \forall\, x \in \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

i.e.,

$$u_{x,\lambda} \le u \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_+ \setminus B_\lambda(x), \quad \forall\, 0 < \lambda < \infty,$$

which, by a calculus lemma(see, e.g., lemma 11.3 in [54]), implies (82). Let

$$h(t) := u(0', t) \quad \text{for } t \ge 0.$$

Since $\Delta u \le 0$, we have

$$h''(t) \le 0, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0,$$

so

$$h'(t) \le h'(s), \quad \forall\, t \ge s \ge 0.$$

Hence

$$h(t) - h(s) \le h'(s)(t - s), \quad \forall\, t \ge s \ge 0.$$

and

$$h'(s) \ge \liminf_{t\to\infty} \frac{h(t) - h(s)}{t - s} \ge 0, \quad \forall\, s \ge 0.$$

Since $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_n} = c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}}$ on $\partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$,

$$h'(0) = c h(0)^{\frac{n}{n-2}}.$$

Since $h(0) > 0$ and $h'(0) \ge 0$, we have $c \ge 0$. If $c = 0$, we have $h'(0) = 0$. Recall that $h''(t) \le 0$, so

$$h'(t) \le h'(0) = 0, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0.$$

On the other hand, $h'(t) \ge 0$, so $h'(t) \equiv 0$ and $h(t) \equiv h(0)$. Lemma 5.9 is established.
Proof of Theorem 1.5. If $\alpha < \infty$, the theorem follows from Lemma 5.8. If $\alpha = \infty$, then by Lemma 5.9, (82) holds, and we only need to rule out the possibility of $c > 0$. For this aim, we make use of (29). As before, let

$$h(t) := u(0', t), \quad \forall\, t \ge 0.$$

Claim. $\forall\, a > 0$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{h'(t)}{h(t)^a} = 0. \tag{83}$$

Indeed, if $\lim_{t\to\infty} h(t) = \infty$, then (83) is obvious by $0 \le h'(t) \le h'(0)$. Otherwise, there exists some $b \in [h(0), \infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} h(t) = b.$$

We also know that $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} h'(t)$ exists since $h''(t) \le 0$. So, by the boundedness of $h(t)$, we must have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} h'(t) = 0,$$

which yields (83).

Let $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ denote the eigenvalues of A^u. Then

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1(t) = \cdots = \lambda_{n-1}(t) = -\frac{2}{(n-2)^2}\frac{h'(t)^2}{h(t)^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}}, \\ \lambda_n(t) = -\frac{2}{n-2}\frac{h''(t)}{h(t)^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}} + \frac{2(n-1)}{(n-2)^2}\frac{h'(t)}{h(t)^{\frac{2n}{n-2}}}. \end{cases}$$

By (83) and the equation satisfied by u,

$$\begin{cases} f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_n) = 1, \\ \lambda_1 = o(1), \cdots, \lambda_{n-1} = o(1), \\ \lambda_n = -\frac{2}{n-2}h^{-\frac{n+2}{n-2}}h'' + o(1). \end{cases}$$

By assumption (29), there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)| \ge \delta,$$

so for large t,

$$-\frac{2}{n-2}\frac{h''(t)}{h(t)^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}} \ge \frac{\delta}{2},$$

i.e.,

$$-h''(t) \ge \frac{n-2}{4}\delta h(t)^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}} > \frac{n-2}{4}\delta h(0)^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}.$$

Integrating the above inequality twice leads to

$$-h(t) + h(0) + h'(0)t \ge \frac{n-2}{8}\delta h(0)^{\frac{n+2}{n-2}}t^2, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0.$$

Sending $t \to \infty$ in the above yields a contradiction to the positivity of h. Thus we have ruled out the possibility that $c > 0$. Theorem 1.5 is established.

□

In the rest of this section, we prove Lemma 5.7. We use notations

$e_1 = (1, 0 \cdots, 0)$, $x = (x_1, \cdots, x_n) = (x', x_n)$, $B_r^+ = B_r \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$, and $\partial' B_1^+ := \partial B_1^+ \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Fixing some small $b > 0$ to be specified later, let

$$\phi_b(x) = \begin{cases} x_1, & \forall\ x \in \partial B_1 \cap \{x|x_1 > 0, x_n > 0\}, \\ 0, & \forall\ x \in \partial B_1 \cap \{x|x_1 < 0, x_n > 0\}, \\ -b, & \forall\ x \in \partial B_1 \cap \{x|x_n < 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Define

$$\phi(x) := \frac{1-|x|^2}{n\omega_n} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{\phi_b(y)}{|x-y|^n}\ dS_y, \quad \forall\ x \in B_1, \tag{84}$$

where ω_n denotes the volume of the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$.
We know that $\phi \in C^\infty(B_1) \cap C^0(\bar{B}_1 \setminus \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+)$ and, after fixing some small $b > 0$,

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\phi = 0 \quad \text{in } B_1, \\ \phi(0) > 0, \quad \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \le 1, \\ \limsup\limits_{B_1 \ni x \to \bar{x}} \phi(x) \le \max\{\bar{x}_1, 0\}, \quad \forall\ \bar{x} \in \partial B_1. \end{cases} \tag{85}$$

Claim. There exists a constant $\tilde{C} > 0$, depending only on n, b, such that

$$\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial x_n}(x) \ge \tilde{C} > 0, \quad \forall\ x \in B_1 \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+. \tag{86}$$

Indeed, consider

$$\psi(x', x_n) := \phi(x', x_n) - \phi(x', -x_n), \quad \eta(x) := \frac{b}{2}x_n, \quad \forall\ x = (x', x_n) \in B_1^+.$$

We have

$$\psi \ge \eta \quad \text{on } \partial' B_1^+ \cup (B_1 \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+).$$

And for any $x \in B_1^+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &= \frac{1-|x|^2}{n\omega_n} \int_{\partial B_1} \frac{\phi_b(y) - \phi_b(y', -y_n)}{|x-y|^n}\ dS_y \\ &= \int_{\partial' B_1^+} \Big(\phi_b(y) - \phi_b(y', -y_n)\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{|x-y|^n} - \frac{1}{|x-(y', -y_n)|^n}\Big)\ dS_y > 0, \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\liminf_{x \to \tilde{x}} (\psi - \eta)(x) \ge 0, \quad \forall\ \tilde{x} \in \partial B_1^+.$$

By Maximum Principle, $\psi \ge \eta$ in B_1^+. Since $\psi - \eta = 0$ on $B_1 \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+$, we have

$$\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x_n} \ge \frac{\partial\eta}{\partial x_n} = \frac{b}{2}, \quad \text{on } B_1 \cap \partial\mathbb{R}^n_+.$$

The Claim is proved.

Proof of Lemma 5.7. We only need to prove the lemma with $a = 1, p - q = e_1 := (1 \cdots, 1)$. Indeed, replacing u by $\frac{1}{a}u$, c by $ca^{\frac{2}{n-2}}$, p by $\frac{1}{a}p$ and q by $\frac{1}{a}q$, we can assume $a = 1$. After a rotation, we can assume $p - q = \lambda e_1$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Replacing $u(x)$ by $u(\frac{x}{\lambda})$, c by $\frac{c}{\lambda}$, p, q by $\frac{p}{\lambda}, \frac{q}{\lambda}$ respectively, we can also assume $p - q = e_1$.

Since $\lim\limits_{r\to 0} \frac{\bar{\delta}(r)}{r} = 0$, there exists $0 < \bar{r} < d$ such that

$$\frac{\bar{\delta}(r)}{r} \le \frac{1}{2}\phi(0), \quad \forall\, 0 < r < \bar{r}, \tag{87}$$

where ϕ is defined by (84).

For $0 < r < \bar{r}$, we consider, for $0 < s < r$,

$$\phi^r(x) := 1 + cx_n + q \cdot x' + r\phi(\frac{x}{r}) - \frac{s^{n-2}d}{|x|^{n-2}} - \sup_{(0,r]} \bar{\delta}, \quad \forall\, x \in \overline{B_r \setminus B_s}.$$

By the equations of u and ϕ, we have

$$\Delta(u - \phi^r) \le 0 \quad \text{in } B_r^+ \setminus B_s^+.$$

By the last lines in (79) and (85),

$$\limsup_{B_r^+ \ni x \to \bar{x}} (u(x) - \phi^r(x)) \ge 0, \quad \forall\, \bar{x} \in \partial B_r \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}. \tag{88}$$

Indeed, if $\bar{x}_1 \ge 0$, we have, using $p - q = e_1$,

$$u(x) - \phi^r(x) \ge (1 + p \cdot x' + cx_n - \bar{\delta}(|x|)) - \phi^r(x) \ge x_1 - r\phi(\frac{x}{r}),$$

from which we deduce (88).

If $\bar{x}_1 < 0$, estimate (88) follows from

$$u(x) - \phi^r(x) \ge (1 + q \cdot x' + cx_n - \bar{\delta}(|x|)) - \phi^r(x) \ge -r\phi(\frac{x}{r}).$$

Since $\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(B_1)} \le 1$, we have

$$\phi^r(x) < 1 + cx_n + q \cdot x' - \sup_{(0,r]} \bar{\delta}, \quad \forall\, x \in \partial B_s \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}.$$

Thus, by the last line in (79),

$$u - \phi^r \ge 0 \quad \text{on } \partial B_s \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}. \tag{89}$$

Claim. There exists $\tilde{r} \in (0, \bar{r}]$, s.t., $\forall\ 0 < s < r < \tilde{r}$,

$$\inf_{B_r^+ \setminus B_s^+} (u - \phi^r) \geq 0. \tag{90}$$

Suppose not, we have, by (88), (89), and the strong maximum principle,

$$\inf_{B_r^+ \setminus B_s^+} (u - \phi^r) = (u - \phi^r)(\bar{x}) < 0 \quad \text{for some } \bar{x} \in (\partial \mathbb{R}^n_+ \cap (B_r \setminus \overline{B_s})).$$

At $\bar{x}$,

$$0 \leq \frac{\partial (u - \phi^r)}{\partial x_n} = c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}}(\bar{x}) - c - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_n}(\frac{\bar{x}}{r}) \leq c u^{\frac{n}{n-2}}(\bar{x}) - c - \tilde{C}, \tag{91}$$

where $\tilde{C}$ is the constant in (86).
By the last line in (79), we have, for some universal positive constant C,

$$u(\bar{x}) \geq 1 - C|\bar{x}| \geq 1 - Cr.$$

On the other hand,

$$u(\bar{x}) \leq \phi^r(\bar{x}) \leq 1 + Cr.$$

We deduce from (91), using the above two estimates,

$$0 \leq Cr - \tilde{C},$$

which is impossible if we choose $\tilde{r} < \min\{\frac{\tilde{C}}{C}, \bar{r}\}$. (90) is established.
Sending $s \to 0$ in (90), we obtain

$$u(x) \geq 1 + c x_n + q \cdot x' + r\phi(\frac{x}{r}) - \sup_{(0,r]} \bar{\delta}, \quad \forall x \in B_r^+.$$

Sending $x \to 0$, we have, by (87),

$$\liminf_{B_1^+ \ni x \to 0} u(x) \geq 1 + r\phi(0) - \sup_{(0,r]} \bar{\delta} > 1.$$

Lemma 5.7 is established.

$\square$

6 Appendix A

Lemma 6.1 *Let* $a > 0$ *be a positive number and* α *be a real number. Assume that* $h \in C^1[-4a, 4a]$ *satisfies,* $\forall |\tau| < 2a,\ |s| \le 4a,\ 0 < \lambda < a,\ \lambda < |s - \tau|,$

$$\Big(\frac{\lambda}{|s-\tau|}\Big)^{\alpha} h\Big(\tau + \frac{\lambda^2(s-\tau)}{|s-\tau|^2}\Big) \le h(s). \tag{92}$$

Then

$$|h'(s)| \le \frac{\alpha}{2a} h(s), \quad \forall\ |s| \le a.$$

Proof of Lemma 6.1. By considering $h(as)$, we only need to prove the lemma for $a = 1$. If $\alpha = 0$, it is easy to see that h is identically equal to a constant on $[-1, 1]$. So we always assume that $\alpha \neq 0$. We Only need to show that

$$-h'(s) \le \frac{\alpha}{2} h(s), \quad \forall |s| < 1, \tag{93}$$

since the estimate for $h'(s)$ can be obtained by applying the above $h(-s)$.

Now for $|\tau| < 2$, let $h_\tau(s) := h(\tau + s)$, (92) is equivalent to

$$\Big(\frac{\lambda}{|s-\tau|}\Big)^{\alpha} h_\tau\Big(\frac{\lambda^2(s-\tau)}{|s-\tau|^2}\Big) \le h_\tau(s-\tau), \quad \forall |\tau| < 2,\ |s| \le 4,\ 0 < \lambda < 1,\ \lambda < |s-\tau|,$$

which implies, by setting $x = s - \tau$, that

$$\Big(\frac{\lambda}{|x|}\Big)^{\alpha} h_\tau\Big(\frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2}\Big) \le h_\tau(x), \quad \forall |\tau| < 2,\ 0 < \lambda < 1,\ \lambda < x < 2.$$

Let $y = \frac{\lambda^2 x}{|x|^2} = \frac{\lambda^2}{x}$ in the above, we have

$$y^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} h_\tau(y) \le x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} h_\tau(x), \quad \forall\ 0 < y < x < 1.$$

Thus

$$0 \le \frac{d}{dx}\Big(x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} h_\tau(x)\Big) = \frac{\alpha}{2} x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}-1} h_\tau(x) + x^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} h'_\tau(x), \quad \forall\ 0 < x < 1,$$

i.e

$$\frac{\alpha}{2} h_\tau(x) + x h'_\tau(x) \ge 0, \quad \forall 0 < x < 1.$$

Let $x \to 1$ in the above, we have

$$\frac{\alpha}{2} h_\tau(1) \ge -h'_\tau(1),$$

i.e.

$$\frac{\alpha}{2}h(\tau+1) \geq -h'(\tau+1), \quad \forall|\tau|<2.$$

Estimate (93) follows from the above.

□

Lemma 6.2 *Let $a>0$ be a constant and let $B_{8a} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the ball of radius $8a$ and centered at the origin, $n \geq 3$. Assume that $u \in C^1(B_{8a})$ is a non-negative function satisfying*

$$u_{x,\lambda}(y) \leq u(y), \quad \forall\ x \in B_{4a},\ y \in B_{8a},\ 0<\lambda<2a,\ \lambda<|y-x|,$$

where $u_{x,\lambda}(y) := \Big(\frac{\lambda}{|y|}\Big)^{n-2} u\Big(x + \frac{\lambda^2(y-x)}{|y-x|^2}\Big)$*. Then* $\exists C(n)>0$*, s.t.*

$$|\nabla u(x)| \leq \frac{n-2}{2a}u(x), \quad \forall|x|<a.$$

Proof of Lemma 6.2. For $\forall x \in B_a, e \in \mathbb{R}^n, |e|=1$, let $h(s) := u(x+se)$. Then, by the hypothesis on u, h satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 6.1. Thus we have

$$|h'(0)| \leq \frac{n-2}{2a}h(0),$$

i.e.

$$|\nabla u(x)\cdot e| \leq \frac{n-2}{2a}u(x).$$

Lemma 6.2 follows from the above.

□

7 Appendix B

We first show that we may assume without loss of generality that the f in Theorem $1.1'$ is in addition homogeneous of degree 1. We achieve this by constructing the $\tilde{f}$ which is homogeneous of degree 1, $\tilde{f}^{-1}(1) = f^{-1}(1)$, and satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem $1.1'$.

By the cone structure of Γ, the ray $\{s\lambda \mid s>0\}$ belongs to Γ for every $\lambda \in \Gamma$. By the concavity of f, we deduce from (10) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{\lambda_i}(\lambda)\lambda_i > 0, \qquad \forall\ \lambda \in \Gamma. \tag{94}$$

Since $f(0)=0$, f satisfies (10) and (94), and $f \in C^{4,\alpha}(\Gamma)$, the equation

$$f(\varphi(\lambda)\lambda) = 1, \qquad \lambda \in \Gamma \tag{95}$$

defines, using the implicit function theorem, a positive function $\varphi \in C^{4,\alpha}(\Gamma)$. It is easy to see from the definition of φ that $\varphi(s\lambda) = s^{-1}\varphi(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \Gamma$ and $0 < s < \infty$. Set

$$\tilde f = \frac{1}{\varphi}, \qquad \text{on } \Gamma.$$

By the homogeneity of φ, $\tilde f$ is homogeneous of degree 1. We will show that $\tilde f$ has the desired properties. Clearly, $\tilde f$ is symmetric, (10) is satisfied and $\tilde f^{-1}(1) = f^{-1}(1)$. To prove $\nabla \tilde f \in \Gamma_n$, applying $\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_i}$ to (95), we have

$$0 = f_{\mu_i}(\mu)\varphi(\lambda) + \frac{\varphi_{\lambda_i}(\lambda)}{\varphi(\lambda)} \sum_{j=1}^{n} f_{\mu_j}(\mu)\mu_j,$$

where $\mu = \varphi(\lambda)\lambda$. Since $f_{\mu_i}(\mu) > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{n} f_{\mu_j}(\mu)\mu_j > 0$, we have $\varphi_{\lambda_i}(\lambda) < 0$, i.e.,

$$\tilde f_{\lambda_i} > 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma, \qquad \forall\ 1 \le i \le n.$$

Next we prove the concavity of $\tilde f$. For $\lambda, \bar\lambda \in \Gamma$, we have, by the concavity of f, that

$$\begin{aligned}
& f\Big(\frac{\varphi(\lambda)\varphi(\bar\lambda)}{t\varphi(\bar\lambda) + (1-t)\varphi(\lambda)}[t\lambda + (1-t)\bar\lambda]\Big) \\
= \;& f\Big(\frac{t\varphi(\bar\lambda)}{t\varphi(\bar\lambda) + (1-t)\varphi(\lambda)}\varphi(\lambda)\lambda + \frac{(1-t)\varphi(\lambda)}{t\varphi(\bar\lambda) + (1-t)\varphi(\lambda)}\varphi(\bar\lambda)\bar\lambda\Big) \\
\ge \;& \frac{t\varphi(\bar\lambda)}{t\varphi(\bar\lambda) + (1-t)\varphi(\lambda)} f(\varphi(\lambda)\lambda) + \frac{(1-t)\varphi(\lambda)}{t\varphi(\bar\lambda) + (1-t)\varphi(\lambda)} f(\varphi(\bar\lambda)\bar\lambda) \\
= \;& 1 = f\left(\varphi(t\lambda + (1-t)\bar\lambda)[t\lambda + (1-t)\bar\lambda]\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By (94), f is strictly increasing along any ray in Γ starting from the origin, therefore we deduce from the above that

$$\frac{\varphi(\lambda)\varphi(\bar\lambda)}{t\varphi(\bar\lambda) + (1-t)\varphi(\lambda)} \ge \varphi(t\lambda + (1-t)\bar\lambda),$$

i.e.,

$$t\tilde f(\lambda) + (1-t)\tilde f(\bar\lambda) \le \tilde f(t\lambda + (1-t)\bar\lambda).$$

We have showed that $\tilde{f}$ is a concave function in Γ.
To check $\tilde{f} \in C^0(\overline{\Gamma})$ and $\tilde{f} = 0$ on $\partial\Gamma$, we only need to show that

$$\lim_{\lambda \to \bar{\lambda}, \lambda \in \Gamma} \tilde{f}(\lambda) = 0 \qquad \forall\ \bar{\lambda} \in \partial\Gamma.$$

We show the above by contradiction argument. Suppose the contrary, then for some $\bar{\lambda} \in \partial\Gamma$ there exists a sequence $\lambda^i \in \Gamma$, $\lambda^i \to \bar{\lambda}$, such that $\lim_{i\to\infty} \tilde{f}(\lambda^i) > 0$. It follows that $\varphi(\lambda^i) \to a$ for some $a \in [0, \infty)$. By the continuity of f on $\overline{\Gamma}$, we have $1 = f(\varphi(\lambda^i)\lambda^i) \to f(a\bar{\lambda})$. Since $f = 0$ on $\partial\Gamma$, we have $a > 0$ and $\bar{\lambda} \in \Gamma$, a contradiction. We have proved that the $\tilde{f}$ has the desired properties.

□

Proposition 7.1 *Let V be an open symmetric convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\partial V \neq \emptyset$. Assume that*

$$\nu(\lambda) \in \Gamma_n, \qquad \forall\ \lambda \in \partial V, \tag{96}$$

and

$$\nu(\lambda) \cdot \lambda > 0, \qquad \forall\ \lambda \in \partial V, \tag{97}$$

where $\nu(\lambda)$ denotes the unit inner normal of a supporting plane of V at λ. Then $\Gamma(V)$ as defined in (3) is an open symmetric convex cone with vertex at the origin. Moreover,

$$\Gamma_n \subset \Gamma(V) \subset \Gamma_1, \tag{98}$$

and

$$\Gamma(V) = \{s\lambda \mid \lambda \in \partial V, s > 0\}. \tag{99}$$

Remark 7.1 *No regularity assumption on ∂V is needed.*

To prove Proposition 7.1, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 7.1 *Let V be as in Proposition 7.1. Then*
(i) If $\lambda \in V$, then $\{s\lambda \mid s \geq 1\} \subset V$.
(ii) $0 \notin \bar{V}$.
(iii) If $\lambda \in \partial V$, then $\{s\lambda \mid -\infty < s < 1\} \cap \bar{V} = \emptyset$ and $\{s\lambda \mid s > 1\} \subset V$.

Proof of Lemma 7.1. If (i) does not hold, then there exists some $\lambda \in V$ and $\bar{s} > 1$ such that $\bar{s}\lambda \in \partial V$. By the convexity of V, we have

$$(\lambda - \bar{s}\lambda) \cdot \nu(\bar{s}\lambda) \geq 0.$$

From which, we deduce, by $\bar{s} > 1$, that $\bar{s}\lambda \cdot \nu(\bar{s}\lambda) \leq 0$, contradicting (97). (i) is established.
If $0 \in \bar{V}$, by (97), $0 \notin \partial V$. Hence $0 \in V$. Since V is open, an open neighborhood of 0 belongs to V and therefore, by (i), $V = \mathbb{R}^n$, contradicting the fact that $\partial V \neq \emptyset$. (ii) is established.
Let $\lambda \in \partial V$. For $-\infty < s < 1$, we have, by (97), that $\nu(\lambda)\cdot(s\lambda - \lambda) = (s-1)\nu(\lambda)\cdot\lambda < 0$. Since $\nu(\lambda)$ is an inner normal, $s\lambda \notin \bar{V}$. Thus we have proved the first statement in (iii). Now we prove the second statement in (iii). Let $\lambda \in \partial V$, we know from the first statement of (iii) that $\{s\lambda \mid s > 1\} \cap \partial V = \emptyset$. So either $\{s\lambda \mid s > 1\} \subset V$ or $\{s\lambda \mid s > 1\} \cap V = \emptyset$. Noticing the first case is what we want to prove, we can assume the second case. Then, in view of the first statement of (iii), the line $\{s\lambda \mid s \in R\}$ has no intersection with V. It follows, see theorem 11.2 in [59], that there is a supporting plane of V containing the line $\{s\lambda \mid s \in R\}$, and therefore $\nu(\lambda) \cdot \lambda = 0$, where $\nu(\lambda)$ denotes the unit inner normal to the supporting plane, contradicting (97). (iii) is established.

□

Proof of Proposition 7.1. It is easy to see that $\Gamma(V)$ is an open symmetric convex cone with vertex at the origin. Now we prove that $\Gamma(V) \subset \Gamma_1$.
For any $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \Gamma(V)$, let

$$\begin{cases} \lambda^1 &= \lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n), \\ \lambda^2 &= (\lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_n, \lambda_1), \\ &\vdots \\ \lambda^n &= (\lambda_n, \lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_{n-1}). \end{cases}$$

Since $\Gamma(V)$ is symmetric, $\lambda^i \in \Gamma(V)$, $\forall\ 1 \leq i \leq n$. By the convexity of $\Gamma(V)$,

$$\bar{\lambda} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda^i = \frac{\sigma_1(\lambda)}{n} e \in \Gamma(V),$$

where $e = (1, \cdots, 1)$, $\sigma_1(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i$.
Let

$$\bar{s} := \inf\{s > 0 |\ s\bar{\lambda} \in V\}.$$

By (ii) in Lemma 7.1, $\bar{s} > 0$ and $\bar{s}\bar{\lambda} \in \partial V$. Let $\nu(\bar{s}\bar{\lambda})$ be the unit inner normal of a supporting plane of V at $\bar{s}\bar{\lambda}$, we have, by (97),

$$0 < \nu(\bar{s}\bar{\lambda}) \cdot (\bar{s}\bar{\lambda}) = \frac{\bar{s}}{n}\sigma_1(\nu(\bar{s}\bar{\lambda}))\sigma_1(\lambda).$$

By (96), $\sigma_1(\nu(\bar{s}\bar{\lambda})) > 0$, thus $\sigma_1(\lambda) > 0$, i.e. $\Gamma(V) \subset \Gamma_1$.
Next we prove $\Gamma_n \subset \Gamma$ by contradiction argument. Suppose $\exists\ \mu \in \Gamma_n \setminus \Gamma(V)$. Take any $\lambda \in \Gamma(V) \subset \Gamma_1$. Consider the 2-dimensional plane $\mathbb{P}$ generated by μ and λ. We know that $\Gamma(V) \cap \mathbb{P}$ lies on one side of the line $\partial\Gamma_1 \cap \mathbb{P}$. So $\{s\mu \mid s \in \mathbb{R}\} \cap \Gamma(V) = \emptyset$ and therefore $\Gamma(V) \cap \mathbb{P}$ stays on one side of $\{s\mu \mid s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ in $\mathbb{P}$, i.e.

$$\left\{\tilde{\mu} \in \mathbb{P} \mid \tilde{\mu} \cdot [\lambda - (\lambda \cdot \frac{\mu}{|\mu|})\frac{\mu}{|\mu|}] < 0\right\} \cap \Gamma(V) = \emptyset.$$

Fix some $\tilde{\mu} \in \Gamma_n \cap \mathbb{P}$ such that

$$\tilde{\mu} \cdot [\lambda - (\lambda \cdot \frac{\mu}{|\mu|})\frac{\mu}{|\mu|}] < 0.$$

Then the line $\ell := \{s\tilde{\mu} \mid s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ has no intersection with $\overline{V} \cap \mathbb{P}$. Now parallelly moving ℓ towards $\overline{V} \cap \mathbb{P}$ and a first touching of the moving line and $\overline{V} \cap \mathbb{P}$ must occur. Let $\bar{\ell}$ denote the first touching line and let $\bar{\lambda} \in \bar{\ell} \cap (\overline{V} \cap \mathbb{P})$. Clearly $\bar{\lambda} \in \partial V$ and $\bar{\ell} \cap V = \emptyset$. So there exists a supporting plane of V at $\bar{\lambda}$ which contains $\bar{\ell}$. Let $\nu(\bar{\lambda})$ denote the unit inner normal of the supporting plane, then, $\nu(\bar{\lambda}) \cdot \tilde{\mu} = 0$, a contradiction to $\tilde{\mu} \in \Gamma_n$ and $\nu(\bar{\lambda}) \in \Gamma_n$ by (96). Thus $\Gamma_n \subset \Gamma(V)$. (98) is established.

Let

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(V) := \{s\lambda |\ \lambda \in \partial V, s > 0\}.$$

Next we show that $\Gamma(V) = \tilde{\Gamma}(V)$. For $\lambda \in V$, consider the ray $\{s\lambda |\ s > 0\}$. Since $0 \notin \bar{V}$, we know that

$$\bar{s} := \inf\{s |\ s\lambda \in V\} > 0.$$

By the openness of V and the definition of $\bar{s}$, $\bar{s}\lambda \in \partial V$. So $\lambda \in \tilde{\Gamma}(V)$. We have showed that $\Gamma(V) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}(V)$. On the other hand, by (ii) and (iii) of Lemma 7.1, $\tilde{\Gamma}(V) \subset \Gamma(V)$. We have established (99). Proposition 7.1 is established.

□

In the following, we deduce the equivalence of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.1′.
Theorem 1.1 ⇒ Theorem 1.1′. Let $V := \{\lambda \in \Gamma |\ f(\lambda) > 1\}$. By (9) and (10), $\Gamma(V) = \Gamma$. By the concavity and symmetry of f, V is open, symmetric and convex. Clearly $\partial V = \{\lambda \in \Gamma |\ f(\lambda) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$ is $C^{4,\alpha}$ and ∇f is inner normal to ∂V. Therefore $\nabla f \in \Gamma_n$ implies (1). In the above, we have proved the concavity of f and (10) forces $\nabla f(\lambda) \cdot \lambda > 0$. Restricted onto ∂V, we have (2). Hence Theorem 1.1′ follows from Theorem 1.1.
Theorem 1.1′ ⇒ Theorem 1.1. We only need to construct a pair (f, Γ) satisfying all the assumptions in Theorem 1.1′ and $\{f = 1\} = \partial V$. Let $\Gamma := \Gamma(V)$ as defined

in (3). By Proposition 7.1, (6) and (7) hold for Γ. Let $f(s\lambda) := s$ for any $s \geq 0$ and any $\lambda \in \partial V$. By (99), $\Gamma = \{s\lambda | \ \lambda \in \partial V, \ s > 0\}$. So f is well defined, symmetric and $C^{4,\alpha}$ on Γ. It is easy to see from the definition that f is homogeneous of degree 1, therefore (10) follows directly. To prove f is concave, taking any two points $a\lambda$ and $b\mu$ in Γ, where $\lambda, \mu \in \partial V$ and $a, b > 0$. For any $0 \leq t \leq 1$, since $\lambda, \mu \in \partial V$ and $\bar{V}$ is convex, we have $\bar{\lambda} := \frac{ta}{ta+(1-t)b}\lambda + \frac{(1-t)b}{ta+(1-t)b}\mu \in \bar{V}$. Recall the definition of f, we have $\frac{\bar{\lambda}}{f(\bar{\lambda})} \in \partial V$. However, by (i) and (iii) in Lemma 7.1, we know $s\bar{\lambda} \in V$ for any $s > 1$, therefore $\frac{1}{f(\bar{\lambda})} \leq 1$, i.e., $f(\bar{\lambda}) \geq 1$. From which, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& f(ta\lambda + (1-t)b\mu) \\
= \ & (ta + (1-t)b) f\Big(\frac{ta}{ta+(1-t)b}\lambda + \frac{(1-t)b}{ta+(1-t)b}\mu\Big) \\
= \ & (ta + (1-t)b) f(\bar{\lambda}) \geq ta + (1-t)b = tf(a\lambda) + (1-t)f(b\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

f is concave.
Now the only assumption left to check is that f can be continuously extended to $\partial\Gamma$ and varnishes on $\partial\Gamma$. To see this, take any sequence $\{\lambda^i\}$ in Γ with $\lambda^i \to \bar{\lambda} \in \partial\Gamma$. We need to show $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty} f(\lambda^i) = 0$. Suppose not, there exists a subsequence of $\{\lambda^i\}$, still denoted by $\{\lambda^i\}$ such that $f(\lambda^i) \geq \delta$ for some constant $\delta > 0$. By the definition of f, $\frac{\lambda^i}{f(\lambda^i)} \in \partial V$. On the other hand, $\lambda^i \to \bar{\lambda}$ and $f(\lambda^i) \geq \delta > 0$ implies $\{\frac{\lambda^i}{f(\lambda^i)}\}$ stays in a bounded set of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Hence $\frac{\lambda^i}{f(\lambda^i)} \to \mu$ for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Noticing ∂V is closed, $\mu \in \partial V$. By (99), $\{s\mu \mid s > 0\} \subset \Gamma$. Recall $0 \notin \partial V$ and $\lambda^i \to \bar{\lambda}$, we have $f(\lambda^i)$ is uniformly bounded. W.l.o.g., we can assume $f(\lambda^i) \to c_0 > 0$. It follows that

$$\partial\Gamma \ni \bar{\lambda} \leftarrow \lambda^i = f(\lambda^i)\frac{\lambda^i}{f(\lambda^i)} \to c_0\mu \in \Gamma,$$

a contradiction. Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 1.1′.

□

In the rest of this section, we address Remark 1.1. We assume that $\partial V \in C^{2,\alpha}$, but the principle curvatures of ∂V are positive. Let $P_1 := \partial\Gamma_1$. After a rotation of the axis system, ∂V can be represented as the graph of a $C^{2,\alpha}$ function $\bar{\phi}$ defined on $P_1 \equiv \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ satisfying

$$(\nabla^2\bar{\phi}) > 0 \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^{n-1}. \tag{100}$$

Γ_n in the new axis system is still an open convex cone, denoted by $\tilde{\Gamma}_n$. The assumptions (96) and (97) are translated into

$$(-\nabla\bar{\phi}(y'), 1) \in \tilde{\Gamma}_n, \quad (-\nabla\bar{\phi}(y'), 1) \cdot (y', \bar{\phi}(y')) > 0, \qquad \forall \ y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}. \tag{101}$$

In the following, all the functions are defined on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ if not specified. For $R > 0,\ \epsilon > 0$, consider

$$\phi_R^\epsilon := \rho_R\bar{\phi}^\epsilon + (1-\rho_R)\bar{\phi},$$

where $\bar{\phi}^\epsilon$ is the smooth mollifier of $\bar{\phi}$ and ρ_R is a radially symmetric cut-off function having value 1 in B_R and 0 outside B_{2R}. Let V_R^ϵ be the set above the graph of ϕ_R^ϵ. For any $R > 0$, ϕ_R^ϵ is identically equal to $\bar{\phi}$ outside B_{2R} and $\phi_r^\epsilon \to \bar{\phi}$ in $C_{loc}^{2,\alpha}$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, so, for some small $\epsilon = \epsilon(R) > 0$, (96) and (97) hold for ϕ_R^ϵ. Noticing ∂V_R^ϵ coincides with ∂V when $|y'| \geq 2R$, therefore we can assume, for the same small ϵ, $\Gamma(V_R^\epsilon) = \Gamma(V)$. Back to $\Gamma(V)$, V and V_R^ϵ define f and f_R^ϵ as homogeneous functions of degree 1 in $\Gamma(V_R^\epsilon) = \Gamma(V)$ taking value 1 on ∂V and ∂V_R^ϵ respectively. f_R^ϵ satisfies all the assumptions of f assumed in Theorem 1.1$'$. Now taking a sequence $R_i \to \infty$ and taking $\epsilon_i > 0$ such that (100) and (101) hold for $\phi_{R_i}^{\epsilon_i}$. Let $f_{R_i}^{\epsilon_i}$ be the corresponding function on $\Gamma(V)$. We know $f_{R_i}^{\epsilon_i}$ satisfies all the assumptions of f in Theorem 1.1$'$ and is smooth in any compact subset of Γ and $f_{R_i}^{\epsilon_i} \to f$ in $C_{loc}^{2,\alpha}(\Gamma)$.

Consider the equation

$$f_{R_i}^{\epsilon_i}(\lambda(A_{u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g})) = 1, \quad \lambda(A_{u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g}) \in \Gamma, \quad \text{on } M^n. \tag{102}$$

Applying Theorem 1.1$'$ to $(f_{R_i}^{\epsilon_i}, \Gamma)$, we have, for any solution u_i of the equation (102),

$$\|u_i\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(M^n,g)} + \|u_i^{-1}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(M^n,g)} \leq C \tag{103}$$

for some constant C is independent of i — this is clear from the proof of Theorem 1.1$'$. This implies $\lambda(A_{u_i^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g})$ stays in a compact subset of Γ independent of i. Hence for i large enough, $f_{R_i}^{\epsilon_i}$ is $C^{4,\alpha}$ in this compact subset and we have, by (103) and Schauder theory, that

$$\|u_i\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g)} \leq C_i,$$

where C_i is some constant may depending on i.
Following the degree arguments at the end of the proof of Theorem 1.1$'$ and replacing O_t^* by

$$\begin{aligned} O_t^i \ := \ & \{u \in C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g) | \|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(M^n,g)} + \|u^{-1}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(M^n,g)} \leq 2C, \\ & \|u\|_{C^{4,\alpha}(M^n,g)} \leq 2C_i, \quad \lambda(A_{u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g}) \in \Gamma\}, \end{aligned}$$

we can find a solution u_i of (102). Since u_i is uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\alpha}(M^n,g)$, after passing to a subsequence, u_i converges in $C^2(M^n,g)$ to some function u in $C^{2,\alpha}(M^n,g)$. Sending $i \to \infty$ in (102), we have

$$f(\lambda(A_{u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g})) = 1, \quad \lambda(A_{u^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g}) \in \Gamma, \quad \text{on } M^n.$$

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti, A. Malchiodi and Y.Y. Li, On the Yamabe problem and the scalar curvature problems under boundary conditions, Math. Ann. 322 (2002), 667-699.

[2] T. Aubin, Équations différentielles non linéaires et probléme de Yamabe concernant la courbure scalaire, J. Math. Pures Appl. 55 (1976), 269-296.

[3] T. Aubin, Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[4] G. Bianchi, Non-existence of positive solutions to semilinear elliptic equations on $\mathbb{R}^n$ or $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ through the method of moving planes, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 22 (1997), 1671-1690.

[5] S. Brendle, A family of curvature flows on surfaces with boundary. Math. Z. 241 (2002), 829-869.

[6] S. Brendle and J. Viaclovsky, A variational characterization for $\sigma_{n/2}$, preprint.

[7] R. L. Bryant, P. A. Griffiths and D. A. Grossman, Exterior Differential Systems and Euler-Lagrange Partial Differential Equations, arXiv:math.DG/0207039 v1 3 Jul 2002.

[8] L. Caffarelli, B. Gidas and J. Spruck, Asymptotic symmetry and local behavior of semilinear elliptic equations with critical Sobolev growth, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 42 (1989), 271-297.

[9] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg and J. Spruck, The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations, III: Functions of the eigenvalues of the Hessian. Acta Math. 155 (1985), 261-301.

[10] S.Y. A. Chang, M. Gursky and P. Yang, An equation of Monge-Ampere type in conformal geometry, and four-manifolds of positive Ricci curvature, Ann. of Math. 155 (2002), 709-787.

[11] S.Y. A. Chang, M. Gursky and P. Yang, An a priori estimate for a fully nonlinear equation on four-manifolds, J. Anal. Math. 87 (2002), 151-186.

[12] S.Y. A. Chang, M. Gursky and P. Yang, Non-linear Partial Differential equations in Conformal Geometry, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. I (Beijing, 2002), 189-209.

[13] S.Y. A. Chang, M. Gursky and P. Yang, A conformally invariant sphere theorem in four dimensions, Publications de l'IHES, 2003.

[14] S.Y. A. Chang, M. Gursky and P. Yang, Entire solutions of a fully nonlinear equation, Lectures on Partial Differential Equations in honor of Louis Nirenberg's 75th birthday, Chapter 3, International Press, 2003.

[15] S.Y. A. Chang, F. Hang and P. Yang, On a class of locally conformally flat manifolds, preprint.

[16] W. Chen and C. Li, Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations, Duke Math. J. 63 (1991), 615-622.

[17] P. Cherrier, Problèmes de Neumann nonlinéaires sur les variétés Riemanniennes, J. Func. Anal. 57 (1984), 154-207.

[18] O. Druet, From one bubble to several bubbles: the low-dimensional case, J. Diff. Geom. 63 (2003), 399-473.

[19] J.F. Escobar, Uniqueness theorems on conformal deformation of metric, Sobolev inequalities, and an eigenvalue estimate, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 43 (1990), 857-883.

[20] J.F. Escobar, Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to a scalar flat metric with constant mean curvature, Ann. of Math. 136 (1992), 1-50.

[21] J.F. Escobar, The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary, J. Diff. Geom., 35 (1992), 21-84.

[22] J.F. Escobar, Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to a constant scalar curvature metric with constant mean curvature on the boundary, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 45 (1996), 917-943.

[23] L.C. Evans, Classical solutions of fully nonlinear, convex, second-order elliptic equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 35 (1982), 333-363.

[24] C. Fefferman and C. R. Graham, Conformal invariants, In: Élie Cartan et les Mathématiques d′aujourd′hui. Asterisque (1985), 95-116.

[25] B. Gidas, W.M. Ni and L. Nirenberg, Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle, Comm. Math. Phys. 68 (1979), 209-243.

[26] M. González, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University, 2004.

[27] B. Guan and J. Spruck, Boundary-value problems on S^n for surfaces of constant Gauss curvature, Ann. of Math. 138 (1993), 601-624.

[28] P. Guan, C.S. Lin and G. Wang, Application of the method of moving planes to conformally invariant equations, preprint.

[29] P. Guan, J. Viaclovsky and G. Wang, Some properties of the Schouten tensor and applications to conformal geometry, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 355 (2003), 925-933.

[30] P. Guan and G. Wang, Local estimates for a class of fully nonlinear equations arising from conformal geometry, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2003, no. 26, 1413-1432.

[31] P. Guan and G. Wang, A fully nonlinear conformal flow on locally conformally flat manifolds, J. Reine Angew. Math. 557 (2003), 219-238.

[32] P.Guan anf G. Wang, Geometric inequalities on locally conformally flat manifolds, preprint.

[33] M. Gursky, The principal eigenvalue of a conformally invariant differential operator, with an application to semilinear elliptic PDE, Comm. Math. Phys. 207 (1999), 131-143.

[34] M. Gursky and J. Viaclovsky, A new variational characterization of three-dimensional space forms, Invent. Math. 145 (2001), 251-278.

[35] M. Gursky and J. Viaclovsky, Fully nonlinear equations on Riemannian manifolds with negative curvature, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 52 (2003), 399-419.

[36] M. Gursky and J. Viaclovsky, A fully nonlinear equation on four-manifolds with positive scalar curvature, J. Differential Geom. 63 (2003), 131-154.

[37] M. Gursky and J. Viaclovsky, A conformal invariant related to some fully nonlinear equations, preprint.

[38] Z.C. Han, Local C^0 estimates for solutions of the σ_k-Yamabe problem under small volume condition, preprint.

[39] Z.C. Han and Y.Y. Li, The existence of conformal metrics with constant scalar curvature and constant boundary mean curvature, Comm. Anal. Geom. 8 (2000), 809-869.

[40] Z.C. Han and Y.Y. Li, The Yamabe problem on manifolds with boundary: Existence and compactness results, Duke Math. J. 99 (1999), 489-542.

[41] N.V. Krylov, Boundedly inhomogeneous elliptic and parabolic equation in a domain, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR 47 (1983), 75-108.

[42] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 334 (2002), 1-6.

[43] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, A fully nonlinear version of the Yamabe problem and a Harnack type inequality, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 336 (2003), 319-324.

[44] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 56 (2003), 1416-1464.

[45] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, A fully nonlinear version of the Yamabe problem and a Harnack type inequality, arXiv:math.AP/0212031 v1 2 Dec 2002.

[46] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, A Liouville type theorem for some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, arXiv:math.AP/0212376 v1 30 Dec 2002.

[47] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, A general Liouville type theorem for some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, arXiv:math.AP/0301239 v1 21 Jan 2003.

[48] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, Further results on Liouville type theorems for some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, arXiv:math.AP/0301254 v1 22 Jan 2003.

[49] A. Li and Y.Y. Li, On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, Part III, in preparation.

[50] Y.Y. Li, Degree theory for second order nonlinear elliptic operators and its applications, Comm. in Partial Differential Equations 14 (1989), 1541-1578.

[51] Y.Y. Li, Some existence results of fully nonlinear elliptic equations of Monge-Ampere type, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 43 (1990), 233-271.

[52] Y.Y. Li, On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. III (Beijing, 2002), 177-184.

[53] Y.Y. Li, Liouville type theorems for some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations, Rend. Mat. Acc. Lincei, s. 9, v. 14:219-225 (2003).

[54] Y.Y. Li and L. Zhang, Liouville type theorems and Harnack type inequalities for semilinear elliptic equations, J. Anal. Math. 90 (2003), 27-87.

[55] Y.Y. Li and L. Zhang, Compactness of solutions to the Yamabe problem, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, to appear.

[56] Y.Y. Li and L. Zhang, A Harnack type inequality for the Yamabe equation in low dimensions, Calculus of Variations and PDEs, to appear.

[57] Y.Y. Li and M. Zhu, Uniqueness theorems through the method of moving spheres, Duke Math. J. 80 (1995), 383-417.

[58] Y.Y. Li and M. Zhu, Yamabe type equations on three dimensional Riemannian manifolds, Communications in Contemporary Math. 1 (1999), 1-50.

[59] R. T. Rockafellar, Convex Analysis, Princeton Univ. Press, tenth printing and first paper back, 1997.

[60] M. Obata, The conjecture on conformal transformations of Riemannian manifolds, J. Diff. Geom. 6 (1971), 247-258.

[61] R. Schoen, Conformal deformation of a Riemannian metric to constant scalar curvature, J. Diff. Geom. 20 (1984), 479-495.

[62] R. Schoen, On the number of constant scalar curvature metrics in a conformal class, Differential Geometry: A symposium in honor of Manfredo Do Carmo (H.B. Lawson and K. Tenenblat, eds), Wiley, 1991, 311-320.

[63] R. Schoen, Courses at Stanford University, 1988, and New York University, 1989.

[64] R. Schoen and S.T. Yau, Conformally flat manifolds, Kleinian groups and scalar curvature. Invent. Math. 92 (1988), 47-71.

[65] R. Schoen and S.-T. Yau, Lectures on differential geometry, International Press, Cambridge, MA, 1994.

[66] N. Trudinger, Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Cl. Sci. (3) 22 (1968), pp. 265-274.

[67] N.S. Trudinger, On the Dirichlet problem for Hessian equations, Acta Math. 175 (1995), 151-164.

[68] N.S. Trudinger and X. Wang, Hessian measures II, Ann. of Math. 150 (1999), 579-604.

[69] J. Urbas, Hessian equations on compact Riemannian manifolds, Nonlinear problems in mathematical physics and related topics, II, 367–377, Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.), 2, Kluwer/Plenum, New York, 2002.

[70] J. Viaclovsky, Estimates and existence results for some fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds, Comm. Anal. Geom. 10 (2002), 815-846.

[71] J. Viaclovsky, Conformal geometry, contact geometry, and the calculus of variations, Duke Math. J. 101 (2000), 283-316.

[72] J. Viaclovsky, Conformally invariant Monge-Ampere equations: global solutions, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 352 (2000), 4371-4379.

[73] H. Yamabe, On a deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds, Osaka Math. J. 12 (1960), 21-37.